

WHY THE NATIONS CANNOT DISARM

MR. Drinkwater, in a recent article in the *Daily Telegraph* on the importance of words, points out the effect which discussions between the representatives of the great powers have on the promotion of the cause of peace. Words create an atmosphere and this atmosphere is a constraint or check on the nations who wish to go to war. The past year has seen no diminution in the words of peace, which go to create that atmosphere, but can an honest judge speak of it as having been a good year for peace? As year follows year and the span of time which divides us from the experience of war grows wider, is it possible to persuade ourselves that these constant words of peace mean as much as they used to? Words are important—only a cynic would deny it—but they sound as well when they are meant and when they are only half meant. They were meant in 1919; are they as fully meant in 1929? We should be glad to think so. It is hard to believe that, outside a narrow militaristic circle or outside the breeding grounds of militant communism, there can exist a real acceptance of war, as a not-wholly undesirable thing. The majority at least do not want it, but somehow its spirit haunts us, and year by year while it is openly repudiated by every one, its menace does not seem to decrease. Like that industrial fever of strife which caused so much misery in the 19th century, and which could be imputed to no one in particular, this spirit of war, this suspicion that it is round the next corner but one, is still over us; and, just because it seems the result of impersonal forces, we feel the less able to check its advance; we multiply our protests of good will and irresponsibility, but we feel little trust in these.

Now, whenever either in history or in politics, we come across a development for which no one seems responsible, it is wise to enquire into the economic forces, which lie below the apparent causes. The desire to live, and to live according to a reasonable standard of life, is the most powerful force in the world, in the sense that it is the basis or condition of every other desire or aspiration. But merely because it is such a universal spring of action it must constantly lead to conflict: the result of this constant clash of interests, for which no one can be said to be really responsible. It is, as

Mr. Lindsay has shown, analogous to the events which follow a fire alarm in a theatre; all might escape if all thought of the rest, whereas everyone fights for himself and everyone is burnt. One key to the history of the last hundred years is undoubtedly this unchecked fight of individuals and of nations for a higher standard of life, resulting finally in war. It would seem that if the war-menace remains the same cause must be still at work.

Two years ago, the Dr. Lee's Professor of Chemistry in the University of Oxford, Frederick Soddy, attempted to apply the scientific method to the problems of Economics in a work entitled "*Wealth, Virtual Wealth and Debt.*" Among other interesting conclusions he made the following startling statement, which we quote in full:—

In the eight years that have elapsed since Peace, the clouds of darkness have again descended, and already people know in their hearts that it is only a matter of time before another war will come. . . . Not one iota of the fundamental economic causes which have produced the last has been altered. The peace has abundantly sown the seeds of future national conflict. The vast potential productivity of the industrialized world, particularly in the engineering and chemical industries, must find an outlet. If that outlet is by financial folly denied it in the building up and reconstruction of the home life of nations, it remains as a direct and powerful incentive to the fomenting of war. If anyone doubts, let them visit, for example, a modern steel works. . . . Even if he chanced on a day when the plant was in full operation, he would see only a man here and there doing almost nothing to speak of, where only a generation ago, the place would have been alive with an army of almost naked workmen. . . . A few 15,000 h.p. motors, worked with the sunshine of the summers of the palaeozoic era, have emancipated the human worker to leisure in the streets, to live on the dole and rear his family so against the day when the nation shall need them all again, and war, the consumer, shall turn all this potential wealth into national debt. Yet we affect to be shocked by the customs of the ancients, who exposed their superfluous young naked to the rigours of winter's night, or sacrificed them with music and religious fervour on the altars of Moloch and Mammon.

Professor Soddy's thesis is technical and difficult, and we will not attempt to outline it here; but we may take his prophecy as a text to be expounded by somewhat simpler considerations, inquiring whether the "capitalist system" as it is generally called, will not inevitably lead to what the Professor fears, and whether, therefore, it is not in the field of economics that there will be found the answer to the puzzle—why does everyone seem to regard as inevitable an evil which nobody really desires?

The present economic system is based on one main principle: the search on the part of the individual for the highest possible profit, in terms of money. This does not mean that no other principle exists; there is such a thing as charity; there is such a thing as public finance; still these latter motives are but slight checks that fail to make any essential change in the working of the main principle. The system has its defenders; they can point out that it works fairly well and that it is based on human nature; but the best defence is one which the father of modern economics, Adam Smith, thought out. He argued that profit cannot possibly be obtained without rendering a service to others, hence in profit-making, the individual is serving his neighbour in serving himself, and, therefore, from a service which springs from selfishness, everybody must benefit. Moreover, the more the individual, self-engrossed, prospers, the better for the community at large. An argument so flattering to human nature, which moreover turns our innate desire to excel into a Christian virtue, has had a far wider acceptance than the warnings of Christ against covetousness. It captivated the 19th century, and it has served in its day to justify the worst injustices in the history of pure Capitalism. We should like to speak of it as of something past and gone, but, lest any should think that its force is spent, they are invited to read Sir Ernest Benn's "Confessions of a Capitalist," a book as sincere in intention as it is pernicious in moral effect.

If they are puzzled by the cogency of Sir Ernest's reasoning, they are asked to add everywhere to the words "demand" and "service," the words, "that is calculable in terms of cash," and then to ask themselves whether his benevolence is as real as he thinks it is. It is significant that the Manchester School and its followers have invariably lost sight of that little addition, in their theory, though it is hardly necessary to add that they do not forget it in practice.

However, whether it can be defended or not, there is no dis-

puting that the return of money to the individual is the motive power behind the production of wealth. Let us see what this means in practice. We may take three instances of Capitalist production; one, Capitalism at its best, the next, at its average, and the third at its worst.

The Ford motor industry is the first example. Ford has added greatly to the real wealth of the world, for he has organized the production of cars in such a way as to save much human energy in their manufacture; hence they are cheap, and many people can buy them. At the same time, he has increased the demand for cars, and his policy is to increase that demand as fast as he can. There can be no doubt that cheap cars are a source of real temptation to many, inducing them for the sake of immediate pleasure or convenience to mortgage their future and to lessen their expenditure on more important commodities—food, clothes, home, the needs of wife and children. Hence it may be fairly argued that, looked at in terms of real wealth, the Ford industry has been far less successful than appears at first sight. But, note that this last consideration is of no interest to Mr. Ford himself as a capitalist, for he is thinking, not in terms of real wealth, *i.e.*, the real needs of the people, but in terms of his money returns, which depend entirely on the sale of his cars.

Next, let us take the brewing industry. Nothing pays like providing beer, because it is within the reach of most purses; it causes an immediate pleasure of some intensity; the demand for it appears to be almost inexhaustible, for, within very wide limits, the more it is drunk the more it is desired. All these qualities speedily attracted Capitalism, and this country was provided with an abundance of public houses, and a super-abundance of cheap beer; not by any means a necessary of life though doubtless an aid to its amenities, but proving in practice a manifest source of disease and degradation, destitution and crime. Meanwhile the beer kings were pocketing their millions and trying on their coronets, utterly indifferent to the sinister results of their methods of making money. But as Capitalists they are no more to be blamed than Mr. Ford; they probably never thought of their production save as a source of revenue. And that is the crux of the matter. Money returns under the present system have no direct relation to the quality of the wealth of which they are the cash equivalent. It just happens that the evil and good of the motor industry balance one another, while the evil of drink-trade as at present conducted far outweighs the

good ; but it is all the same to the financiers, for their returns are not measured in motors or drink, but in the money which is a claim on any real wealth they may need.

In both these instances, however, there is some production to justify the money return ; in our last, a money return is due to the absence of production, or scarcity. Scarcity can be created, and thus a valuable (in the economic sense) is obtained. The case of diamonds is well known, but in this case their only value lies in their scarcity ; not so with bread, land, or air ; in so far as it is possible to monopolize these, it is possible to increase the money of the individual and of the country, while actually making the people poorer, since as a result they will have to give up something to obtain these necessities, which have gone up in price owing to the monopoly. Here we get a very clear example of the difference between money and wealth. If money is halved, its value is doubled ; if money is doubled its value is halved. It would seem to follow that the accumulation of money which is not the result of an increase of real wealth is lost labour, since its value will diminish with its increase. This is true enough when the whole world is taken into consideration ; but, in the first place, the nation, and, in the second, the individual can up to a point increase the quantity of money without diminishing its purchasing power. So long as there is real wealth to be obtained outside the home country, the increasing money returns of the home capitalists can be used for its purchase, or its exploitation, and thus luxury trades dependent on the foreigner are set up at home, while the real productive wealth of the country is allowed to decay : a state of affairs only too clear in this country at the present moment. Worse still, individuals are able to make use of their increased money returns, to which no real increase of wealth corresponds, before the value of money decreases ; by the time it has decreased, their profits will have risen : the same process starts again, and so they always keep a step ahead of the bad effects they produce. In this way, they can profit at the expense of the community until a financial crash ruins exploiters and exploited alike.

The potential evils of the capitalists' ability to draw a distinction between money and wealth, and therefore be content to obtain the first without the production of the second, will be greater in so far as capital tends to become concentrated in a few hands. The capitalist who controls great masses of capital, even if he wished to augment wealth, is not in touch

with the real needs of the people, except as measured in effective money demands; if these do not look so tempting as other demands anywhere in the world market, the needs of his fellow countrymen will go begging. The peasant proprietors of France invest their capital in their property, remaining poor in money, but rich in wealth; the English landed gentry did much the same, but the big financier has no interest in anything but what is likely to bring him in a big money return; he discerns with an eagle eye the advantages of supplying natives with cheap gin as payment for their rubber, and so his money will not produce red cheeks and bonny babies, but demoralized natives, cheaper tyres, and two or three hundred per cent. on his own behoof. Nor can the small investor do much to check this prostitution of finance, although he confines his share-buying to honest enterprises; even so, someone has to remove his money to make room for him. In any case it is only the big investments or the big sellings that make or ruin companies. The capitalist system has become so impersonal and so non-moral that good men and women may often become unknowing promoters of immorality, cruelty and starvation.

The one thing that occupies the mind of the big-scale capitalist, judging always by what we see, is not the good or harm that he may do, but the search for a market that means large money profits.

Now, it happens that among the best investments within the reach of the capitalist, there is one the avowed object of which is nothing less than the destruction of wealth, viz., war, its preparations and its conduct. Its preparations, in other words, armaments, can be shown to be an invaluable money-making investment, and the complete withdrawal of that market would be a disaster to big finance. It has been calculated that in this country—not so heavily armed as some others—a total of £57½ per family per annum is being paid as the result of past debts and present expense on armaments. If we subtract from this the amount of it that goes to pay wages and salaries, we shall be left with a rough estimate of the yearly return on capital invested in war and its consequences. According to Bowley, wages and salaries take 62 per cent. of the nation's income, so if we subtract that amount from the expenditure that goes to make armaments, as distinguished from the money that pays the debt, we find that about £320,000,000 is the annual profit and unearned income due to war, past and future, a fourth of the whole annual

profit and unearned income of the inhabitants of this country.¹ The big financiers will not, as we have seen, be troubled by the destruction of wealth, which their investments promote, for they deal only with money returns, the common measure in our economic system of food, houses, babies, drink, cinemas, and wars; while the small investor cannot make himself sufficiently felt to make any difference to the investment market. It may be objected that armaments are largely nationalized, arsenals and dockyards being Government property, and that, therefore, the capital spent in them will not return as profits to the capitalist, but merely be transferred from the taxpayer to the employees of the State. But the answer is that more is still done by private firms than by the State and that, in any case, the production of armaments by the State is but the finishing process of a production, the beginnings of which are laid much deeper in the general productivity of the nation and of the world; a long chain of private production leads up to the stage where the State takes control, so that the figures stated above as the annual return due to armaments would have to be considerably enlarged to cover the returns indirectly due to armaments. Is it likely, we may add—and this is the moral of our reflections—that this enormous vested interest, which, partly consciously and partly unconsciously, supports the old political parties, is going to encourage them to take stern measures to stop the production of war and all that feeds it, and thus destroy itself?

The situation in England is bad enough; we little realize the enormous vested interests—coal, steel, iron, chemical, shipping, etc.—which lie behind the pursuit of war, and how our impersonal economic system can delight in the preparation for war, whilst we debate about the conditions of peace; but the state of affairs abroad is worse. In France, and in other militarized countries, the disbanding of the army, the closing of the industries that minister to it would cause an economic crisis; is it likely that France is going to disarm so long as the same interests rule her and finance her war preparations? In Germany, we have the proof of our contention; the war destroyed her real wealth so completely that capitalism there was unable to find occupation except in really productive enterprise; hence her whole energies and capital were concentrated on civil reconstruction, but now that she has become wealthy again, if capitalism has its way we may

¹ The figures are calculated from data given in "Britain's Industrial Future" (Benn), pp. 282, 244.

expect to find the renewal of war preparations, almost as a matter of course. It does not need a War Lord. In other parts of the world, where the financial purity of Governments is not so conspicuous as at home, the making of armaments is a great temptation to "jobbery," and a good speculation for international capital.

We may sum up this part by asserting that in an economic system, based on the obtaining of money returns and not on the direct production of real wealth, measured by real needs, war is ever likely to be encouraged; it is one of the safest, most profitable, and handiest investments, though so far from the real wealth of the country being increased, capital—or claim on surplus production—is simply being transferred from the tax payer to the employees dependent on the preparation of war, through the retentive pockets of the financiers and banks; that the same interests as are behind the Governments which stand for the present system, are behind this form of enterprise; and that, on a more rational, personal and national economic system, it should be possible gradually, and with full compensation, to spend that wasted capital on agriculture, peace industries, town and house building, road-making, and other forms of real wealth, which perhaps may not be from the present standpoint "paying propositions."

After having looked at Capitalism from the point of view of the Capitalist, we may look at it from that of the system itself.

The one good effect of private enterprise, as all must admit, is the stimulation to ever cheaper and more effective means of production. The present economic system, based on private money returns, has been, in a large measure, the cause of the greatest change in economic history, the replacement of human energy by other energy, incredibly cheaper and more effective; and wealth, if we think of it, is largely the making use of energy. But in proportion as capitalism has succeeded in the production of potential wealth, it seems to have failed in the problem of how to distribute it, *i.e.*, how to turn it into the greatest amount of actual wealth, actually enjoyed. The man who gets the wealth is not the man who needs it, but the man who can pay for it; and since the system tends to concentrate money in fewer hands, it tends to make it less and less possible for those who need what is produced to obtain it. The difficulty is never solved; its consequences are only put off. It is possible to accumulate as much money as one likes, but it is not possible to accumulate an indefinite

amount of real wealth, for there is a limit to the amount a person can enjoy per minute; the rest would simply go bad or remain unused. Hence the surplus wealth that is being produced must be distributed to those, who will either buy it or work for it. In either case, money and the power over wealth tends to flow back to those who first possessed it and lent it out, thus increasing the evil of a small class of irresponsible men, who hold all industrial and, indeed, political power, standing over against a much larger class, financially insecure and dependent on the few for the wealth they need. The constant problem facing the first class is how to find a market which can pay; the home market tends to pay less and less, since they hold the money which should be circulating there; hence the great competition for foreign markets, a competition in which this country was successful for a century and the prize for which is the Empire. Now that there are fewer possibilities in that direction, there is an increased inducement for the capitalist to exploit the possibilities of war, the practice which more than any other creates a demand for his commodities and which finds a sure and ample fund for purchase in the money raised by taxes.

We live then in a world where the production of potential wealth is ever becoming cheaper and more efficient, owing to inventions and to the accumulation of capital which can develop them; where work, that in the old days needed an army of labourers, can now be accomplished by one man watching a machine; and yet, where the system positively hinders the changing, by a sensible mode of distribution, of that potential wealth into the actual wealth that is so obviously needed, a system which will allow money to be made by those even who decrease that production. It is sometimes said that unemployment is due to the cheapness of production; but if wealth were more fairly distributed those possessing it would create more employment. There is plenty to be done when once elementary needs have been satisfied; there are plenty of people to do it, and there are plenty of machines ready to increase the real wealth of the world; but somewhere in the system there is a tragic maladjustment; the potential wealth cannot be changed into actual wealth, the results of production cannot be adequately distributed, consumed and enjoyed.

No doubt the industrial malaise of the country is well recognized, and remedies are being sought on all sides. Some take the form of the "dole," which, finally at any rate,

means taxing the employed on behalf of the unemployed. Profit-sharing is another attempt to make the system function justly. Rationalization means simply the elimination of waste. Transport of labour whether to the colonies or to suitable regions at home can never be on a large enough scale to solve the difficulty. The super-tax and death-duties certainly counteract the tendency of money to flow into larger and fewer reservoirs, but they also check production. None of these palliatives touch the root of the disease, as stated at the beginning: the aim of the capitalist to make as much money as possible, irrespective of the means. This is not the place to suggest remedies; we must be content with pointing out that the disease is chronic and deep seated and that no sudden cure can be applied. Until Capitalism re-acquires a soul and a conscience; such as in the days of united Christendom created the concept of the "just price," and so unequivocally condemned usury and profiteering, the cure must come from outside. The Capitalist with his narrow and shortsighted outlook passes; the State, custodian of the general welfare, endures. The diseased part of the industrial body, agriculture, must in one way or another live on the healthy till it recovers. In fact, it is difficult to see how we can be saved without the State, which still lives in the "long run" during which the capitalist dies, gradually undertaking the production of real wealth, and for a time at least displacing the individual whose main aim is the production of money and only indirectly that of wealth.

Meanwhile, the problem of markets and of the rapacious appetites of our great productive machines, or rather of those who itch to make them work at full capacity, finds partial solution, and is always seeking one more complete, in that excellent capitalist investment, armaments and war. Capitalism has given birth to powerful forces, which, guided by reason and conscience, could grow into benefactors of humanity; but which, alas, guided only by covetousness, grow into monsters. Productive capacity has grown so vast that it can be satisfied only on a world-wide scale.

Only a wealthy nation, persuaded that its existence is otherwise in jeopardy, can be induced to pay seven million pounds for a battleship, which needs half a million yearly for maintenance and which becomes obsolete in a few years. The big financiers have no markets so lucrative as this is. Their plant cannot be allowed to rust: their means of production must be used: swords are more profitable than plough-shares,

though the latter mean real wealth and the former only destruction and finally self-destruction. The capitalist stakes all on averting the evil day, and meanwhile reaps the harvest, the money of the hard-pressed tax-payer. In our materialistic civilization, the pursuit of money has turned into a search for destruction rather than for wealth; and under the guise of patriotism but really inspired by finance, a spurious nationalism encourages armaments here, equips large conscript armies there, builds unnecessary ships and constructs useless fortifications, unchecked by a sensational press or by an impotent Government. Nor, as we said at the beginning are they necessarily culpable, except in the cause, for they have abstracted from their world all qualitative differences, even all moral distinctions, and have been so interested in measuring every thing in terms of money that at last they have confounded the measure with the measured—perhaps that is their punishment!

If the reader will turn back a few pages, and re-read Professor Soddy's prophecy, he may now be disposed to admit that it is not just fantastic. Amidst all the good will that is so manifest in the international affairs of the day, there is hiding this great danger, the danger of another unwanted war, due to the forces which direct the production of wealth for the sole purpose of selling it for money to the purchaser who can offer the best price. Such is the last result of that system of "enlightened selfishness," which has found so much favour in this great country from the days of Adam Smith to those of Sir Ernest Benn.

"Ce n'est plus aujourd'hui que surgissent les villes
A la puissante voix d'un sublime Amphion.
Le monde répondra : 'Non, je me civilise;
Je veux des ouvriers, et surtout des soldats;
Le trafic enrichit et la guerre est permise;
Tu me dois ton amour, ton génie et ton bras.' " ¹

MICHAEL DE LA BEDOYERE.

¹ Sully-Prudhomme, "Le Joug."

THE SOCIETY OF ST. GREGORY

SINCE only a small proportion of us can be parishioners of the Metropolitan cathedral, Farm Street, Brompton, Spanish Place and the other few notable areas in London and the provinces, it is no matter for surprise that many Catholics are wont to evince a discontent, more or less divine, with the style and quality of the music that accompanies the liturgical services. It is with pleasure, therefore, that we learn that the twenty-fifth anniversary of the promulgation by Pope Pius X. of his Edict, *Motu proprio*, upon ecclesiastical music has been signalized by an effort to explore the possibilities of the affiliation of this country to the Society of St. Gregory. To those who recognize the need for machinery on a national scale, the provisions of the papal Enactment are sufficiently well known; but what is not fully understood is the fitness of the Society to meet the need, its aim and constitution, the manner in which it functions and the very hopeful prospect of the shares being taken up as soon as they can be floated.

As part of the heritage of the Reformation, the problem is a very old one; but, in our own time, as far back as the pontificate of Pius IX., a solution had been sought in the German *Cecilienverein* and the Netherlands' Association which found no difficulty in coalescing in an international organization, when the Society of St. Gregory was founded in France in 1904. There was to be no ruthless, impetuous rooting-up of the cockle but a gradual readjustment of an instrument of divine worship which had become distorted. But, because the clergy almost everywhere found themselves incompetent to deal with a modern musical idiom in which they had not been trained, the ultimate aim of the movement was the multiplication of *scholae* for the instruction of local musicians. As these could not be reached directly, the means at first employed could only be general *e.g.*, the dissemination of literature, the promotion of summer schools, Gregorian "Days," and *semaines religieuses*.

During the ten years preceding the outbreak of the War the Crusade spread by degrees over Europe. The first great meetings took place at Strasbourg and Milan, and, during the past decade, the Liturgical Congress has been a constantly

recurring feature of Continental activity. Holland and Belgium celebrated in the autumn the golden jubilee of their Federation, and in November last Vittoria was the *venue* of the Spanish convention. In France, Gregorian "Days" have been regular and frequent. A hundred priests with their choirs meet every year in a different town of La Vendée. At Orleans 400 choristers gather from 42 parishes. With the help of a congregation of 2,000 an exhibition of classical harmony and plainsong is rendered by a chorus of 700 at Perigueux and a musical triduum is conducted by the clergy of Paris who take care that districts otherwise unreachable are nourished on journals like *La Tribune* and the *Courrier de St. Gervais*.

As all the national affiliations are built upon a single plan it may be useful to describe the central organization of the American Society which was approved by Pope Benedict in 1915. The Executive consists of nine members, six clerics, and three laymen. Among the former are the President, the general Vice-President, and, in view of the vast area to be covered, two additional Vice-Presidents, representing the North and South States respectively. The Secretary and the editor of the official organ, the "Catholic Choirmaster," are laymen. There are two sub-committees; one for the purpose of revising new compositions, the other comprising the three laymen to whose share falls the more important work of publicity. The rank and file number 1,800; clergy, nuns, educationists, and musicians willing to lend their sympathy to what they call the Pian reform, or actively engaged in its promotion. The subscription is \$2.50 which, however, gives a title to the quarterly journal. It was partly due to the incidence of the War that five years had to elapse before their numbers justified the launching of the first number of their magazine or their first national convention. As we have no experience of a *semaine liturgique* in the British Isles the following account from the *Universe* may be of interest.

In the first week of June 1927, the American branch of the Society of St. Gregory held its sixth annual convention at St. Francis Xavier's College, Cincinnati. As the function coincided with the annual meeting of the Students' Mission Crusade, it is not incredible that as many as 50,000 people were present. At the High Mass in the grounds on the Sunday morning the Proper was

sung by a choir of 1,000, the *Kyrie* harmonized by a body of 11,000 and the Vatican *Credo* declaimed by all. The two following days were occupied with lectures and demonstrations in the Seminary and a concert of sacred music was given during which the choir of St. Mary's, Dayton, rendered various items in the modern idiom and the Seminary *schola* contributed selections of Palestinian polyphony.

In the same year Abbot Ceretti returned from Rome to resume his work in the Pontifical Summer School at New York and every day for six weeks he gave lectures upon the Vatican chant. Men and women trained in this School have gone back fired with the hope of founding similar *scholae* in their own localities; diocesan, *i.e.*, composed of clergy, nuns, instructors and organists with the cathedral for their centre; district; *i.e.*, made up of the same elements reinforced by the Sanctuary Guilds and religious confraternities; lastly, parochial. The local *schola* is an oratorio or sacred operatic society instituted round the choir, the sanctuary or the children's *schola* as its nucleus. This in its turn becomes the kernel of a choir co-extensive with the congregation who, in the course of a single winter, learn to sing the Ordinary of the Mass in the Gregorian or modern medium, or the psalms and hymns of Vespers. The principal object of the *Motu proprio* is thus achieved (and incidentally, the enormous choirs which figured at the Chicago Congress are explained).

The United States' Branch has done its work on a membership of only one in every 10,000 Catholics. On the same ratio an English affiliation would require no more than 250. Nor should we start without a modest balance at the bank. We already have one central *schola* conducted, with the countenance of the Archbishop, by Mr. Allen at Liverpool, where a course of ten weekly ninety-minute demonstrations is given at the cost of a 10s. fee. Between three and four hundred clergy, nuns, musicians, and professional teachers, after examination at this centre, have gained the Stanbrook diploma. Similar schools were established at Birmingham and Forest Gate but for teachers only. We have also the memory, at least, of a successful Summer School opened at Appuldurcombe by the Solesmes Benedictines in 1904-5 and attended by 180 clergy and musicians from England, Ireland, France and even America. Nor was the power of

the Press entirely forgotten. A monthly periodical published in Ireland thirty years ago circulated for over two years in England. It came before its time, but served to blaze the trail. On account of the shyness, isolation, and voluntary status of the large majority of our church musicians at home and abroad, some kind of literature is indispensable. It need not be of the pretentious character of the American "Catholic Choirmaster" which consists of 40 crown-quarto pages of letterpress and 16 pages of music. The cost of printing 1,000 copies quarterly of a similar magazine at the present time in England, would be about £100 a year; but sold at 1s. 6d. there might easily be a profit of £40 or more. There are private individuals willing to take so slight a risk; but a firm that should apply itself to catering for the fifteen million Catholics in the British Empire in a commodity for which there is an urgent demand would reap at least all the advantages of a monopoly. Lastly, although, with the exception of the London musical festival of 1904 and the recent Tudor recital at Liverpool under Dr. Nixon of Lancaster, we have no experience of Gregorian "Days"; and, although the National Liturgical Congress is for us a thing that lies altogether in the future, the facility with which an English Branch might realize the main features of the Society's programme may be gathered from a consideration of the forces already in action, upon which an embryonic association could rely for support.

Outside the public churches, chapels, and mission-stations, there are, besides the eighteen cathedrals, half a dozen theological seminaries, and close upon 1,000 religious houses in which the *Motu proprio* is held in honour.

Liverpool and Salford have each a diocesan musical association. Every diocese has a clerical choir. The clergy number over 4,000. The training in ritual music proper, which almost every priest has received, fits him as completely now, as in mediæval times, to take the lead in the ecclesiastical music of his own parish. In fact, wherever a reform has been recently effected, while in the populous districts the honour is due mainly to the converts, in the smaller country missions it belongs almost entirely to the clergy. The priest is not unconscious that criticism of liturgical music is a veiled indictment, undeserved, of himself. The S.S.G. proposes to bring within decent bounds the spurious harmonic Kyriale custom which makes the musical acolyte omnipotent

and the parochial rector a cypher, and the clergy may, therefore, be trusted to look with favour upon any strong tidal wave that promises to lift the boat off the bank and take it out into deeper water.

Twelve thousand teachers in 1,200 Primary, 100 Institutional, and 500 Secondary Schools have been doing their utmost every year since 1922 to impress the Gregorian stamp upon 420,000 children. As a result of this, although the curious notion still survives that a collective chant like the National anthem should be sung beautifully by a small body instead of being merely sung by everybody, the harmonic mass in the residential schools is already at a discount and the children of half the populous parishes are ready to democratize the music of the Liturgy as soon as the S.S.G. can get into its stride.

Since 1916 Mass-music in the five counties of the diocese of Nottingham has been exclusively Gregorian. Besides the 130 missions of this area, there are thought to be, dotted about the country, some 170 more in which the chant is the staple aliment. To these may be added the 150 Vesper or Compline churches and the 400 choirs that can claim to be liturgical in so far as they are independent of women. In this category I would also include certain mixed choirs like that of St. James' Reading, where the music, besides being what Dr. Johnson would call a "pleasant noise," is, in the main, also Palestrinian.

Catholics are not backward in joining together for the performance of ambitious music outside the church. This music is invariably superior to anything heard at Mass; but it proves the prevalence of talent and the will to submit to direction. There are operatic or orchestral societies at Leigh, Sheffield, Everton, Sunderland, Barrow, Seaham, Fleetwood, Bolton, Carlisle, Coventry and Newport. Choral Unions (central choirs composed of the parochial choirs of the district) flourish at Liverpool, Blackpool, Blackburn, Brindle, Manchester, New Ferry, Salford, Preston, Sutton, Burnley (Note their location; all in the N.W. of England), Birmingham, Cardiff, Bradford, Hull, Wallsend, and a single one in the Province of Westminster, viz., at Spanish Place. Thus, in a public hall on a Sunday night, it is possible to hear a performance of the *Elijah*, Parry's Cecilian Ode, Mozart's 12th Mass, Gounod's *Solennelle* or Beethoven in C given by a body of 50 to 200 strong. Nor are these, func-

tions entirely confined to the concert room. Mr. Hasberry's choral and orchestral association of London Catholics, men and women, last year celebrated the feast of St. James with a *gran bella musica*; and in November 1927 the Birmingham Union, under Father Robert Eaton, produced, at the Edgbaston Oratory, the *Dream of Gerontius*. The trifling matter of dilettante oratorio is not without its practical import. When seven-tenths of our choirs are manned, as it were, by women, no liturgical association can look for a placid course unless the mixed choirs are taken into account; but their hearty concurrence will be permanently secured if it is made plain that there is still a place for women-singers inside the church.

With the exception of Norwich, the seven triennial Congresses have been held in Cathedral cities. In order to ensure a more appropriate musical setting than sufficed for cathedral needs, all the choirs and church musicians of the immediate neighbourhood of each (with the exception of London) were, on these occasions, mobilized under an executive officer, most frequently a priest. These composite choirs still remain, at least in skeleton form; that is to say, so many diocesan *scholae* already exist in germ.

It is hard to tell whether there are any relics of the Cecilian society established here over forty years ago. It had its Council, its tributary choirs and its 5s. subscription per choir. Its short life was not in vain, for, when it succumbed, it took with it what Père Chaminade calls the "conspiracy" against the Congregation of Rites to whom Pope Leo had consigned every department of Ecclesiastical music.

About 1904 there was formed in London an association of Catholic choirmasters. This too, was abortive; but the cause of its failure is instructive. Each member had to pledge his choir to give a polyphonic entertainment for his fellows, in spite of his conviction that in 90 per cent even of London choirs, Palestrina was a sheer impossibility. Now that certain of the more prominent musicians have found themselves unequal to the increasing pressure, they are more than ever ready to acknowledge the advantage of cohesion and the pooling of the general wisdom.

When, during the War, sewing-machine firms were ordered to make shells or dissolve, shells were made. The A.P.F., C.W.L., S.V.P., C.Y.M.S., C.T.S., the Catenians and the K.S.C., are highly organized associations. Each takes the

whole country, the first three the whole world, for its parish. Whatever the object that binds them together, every member is in conscience bound to regard the political aspect of Catholic Education as a primary concern and the Cardinal Archbishop has recently persuaded a number of these and similar bodies to lend their machinery for the better prosecution of the Educational campaign. Each member is obliged also to assist at one Sunday Mass. Pope Pius X. and his two successors have urged him to remove the reproach of anti-Catholic secularity and artistic inefficiency from the music of the Mass by singing it himself. It is not for a moment to be anticipated that a confraternity like the Guild of the Blessed Sacrament, whose privilege it is to guard the honour of the Altar, is going to turn a deaf ear to an appeal from the S.S.G. to bring the music of the Eucharistic Sacrifice within the orbit of its organization.

There are probably 15,000 men and boys in the gallery choirs and a like number in the sanctuaries. An endeavour has for some time been made to amalgamate the latter in an inter-diocesan confraternity under the patronage of St. Stephen. From all accounts the promoters do not seem to have had any great success. The reason is not far to seek. It is not an uncommon thing to see at the principal Sunday Mass a number of men and boys on the Gospel side of the sanctuary facing an equal number on the opposite side, but, beyond adding to the function a note of the picturesque, doing nothing in particular, while their special work of singing is being performed by a rival body at the other end of the church. Whether or not this confraternity is already an accredited National Liturgical Association *sans le savoir*, the members in the stalls are sufficiently alive to the anomaly of their situation to lend their prestige and weight to any other body capable of removing it.

If this sodality has confined its attention more to the etiquette of the Altar than to the duties of the choir, there is another society, equally national in scope, that has generously gone out of its way to add a liturgical wheel to its educational plant and to set it going with power from its own generating station. This is the Conference of Head Teachers of Colleges and Convent Schools; and, just as the schools of the United States are the chief support of the American branch of the S.S.G., the influence of the English schools, with respect to the matter in hand, is perhaps more powerful than

any of the agencies already enumerated; for, while directing the fortunes of 50,000 students in over 500 schools (each with its Old Students' Association), they are in direct touch with the Bishops on the one hand and with the clergy and more fortunate laity, present and future, on the other. Moreover, this is the only society entitled to inscribe on its colours the successful achievement of a national work in connection with the *Motu proprio*, viz., the compilation of the Gregorian manual and the grafting of this manual upon all the schools of the country. Inasmuch as the liturgical committee of this Conference is still in being and claims the right to add to and amend a musical syllabus compulsory in all schools, it exercises one of the functions of the S.S.G.; in other words, the Society of St. Gregory has, in a sense, already been anticipated.

There are probably other forces awaiting fusion which have escaped my notice; but those I have touched upon are, I think, sufficient warrant for the liveliest confidence. I am sanguine enough to affirm also, that, if it were possible for the populous districts to practise a musical programme in which the chant, and not harmony, were allowed to preponderate; and could facilities be created for the performance of this programme on successive Gregorian "Days" in the older cathedral parishes, a national convention in London, coincident or not with the Eucharistic Congress, is eminently practicable in 1929; when the *Credo*, the *Te Deum*, and the Dominican *Salve* might constitute in themselves a rich and appropriate contribution towards the celebration of the Great Centenary.

EDWARD A. MAGINTY.

THE MEDIÆVAL POPES AND THE JEWS¹

WE are concerned in this paper with the attitude of the Mediæval popes to that mysterious people whose separate existence among the nations of the world, for so many centuries since the time of Christ, is one of the most striking of the minor and indirect proofs of the Christian Faith itself.

In this task the method that we propose, mainly, to follow, is to take two of the, historically, most important pontiffs, about whose connection with the matter we have definite record, and to examine, briefly, what that record is. The popes thus selected are St. Gregory the Great (590), and Innocent III. (1198); and this because, as we hope to show, the one stands for the creation of a definite policy towards the Jews, and the other for its principal modification, not in theory, but to some extent in practice.

It would in any case be natural to begin with Pope Gregory the Great (590—604 A.D.), as being thoroughly representative of every side of the Mediæval Papacy, whose special traditions were, in fact, practically created by him. He came into contact with the Jews in his threefold capacity as Head of the Universal Church, secular ruler of the "Patrimony of St. Peter" consisting of territory in many parts of Italy, in Gaul and elsewhere; and as having, in the first of these countries, the dominant civil power.

St. Gregory's attitude to the Jews—based, partly, upon the existing Imperial Law—may be summed up under three heads. First, he was always ready to protect them in their legal rights and according to the principles of natural justice, especially when they appealed to him on their own account. Second, he was intensely anxious for their conversion to the Catholic Faith and encouraged others to accomplish this by all legitimate means. But, third, he never forgot that, consistently with justice and charity to all, his first duty was to his Christian people, and he did not waver for a moment in safeguarding their interests when these seemed endangered

¹ The substance of a paper read before the Lingard Society.

at the hands of others. And this occasionally led him to take restrictive measures with regard to the Jews.

The chief respect in which St. Gregory appears as coercing Hebrew liberties, is in his absolute refusal to allow to Jews the possession of Christian slaves. The principal ground of his objection was that Christians are members of Christ, and, therefore, should not be in subjection to the enemies of Christ.¹ Further than this we have the case of some Jews at Terracina whose synagogue was reported to be so near to the Christian church that the sound of the Hebrew psalmody was a source of disturbance to the congregation. In this case St. Gregory ordered that the place should be diligently inspected, and that, if genuine annoyance were caused, the Jews must cease to worship in that spot. *Another site was, however, to be found for them within the fortress.*² Of this very instructive incident and its sequel more will be said almost immediately.

But if these mildly repressive measures formed a part of St. Gregory's policy towards the Jews we hear far more of his beneficence towards them, both with regard to their protection from injustice and persecution, and their conversion to the Christian Faith.

Under the former of these two heads, we find that the Jews of Terracina, referred to above, were indeed expelled from their synagogue, but having betaken themselves to another spot, with the knowledge and consent of the Pope, they were driven from there also, apparently without cause. Upon hearing of this Gregory wrote to the Bishop complaining of such measures, and commanding that these Jews were to be allowed to worship without molestation on their newly acquired site.³ The spirit underlying the Pope's action is revealed in some words which occur in his former letter on the subject. "We forbid," he says, "the aforesaid Hebrews to be oppressed and vexed unreasonably, but as they are permitted, in accordance with justice, to live under the protection of the Roman laws, let them keep their observances as they have learnt them, no one hindering them."

This incident is not only of interest as showing us St. Gregory's recognition of the principle that under a Christian

¹ Epistle ix. 109. N.B. The references are to St. Gregory's letters. Quotations from Barmby's translation.

² Ep. i. 10.

³ Ep. i. 35.

régime, facilities may be given for Jewish (as distinct from Pagan and heretical) worship, but also as furnishing an early instance of the tendency of subordinates to ignore the instructions of the supreme Pontiff in this matter of the Jews. Of this we shall see a good deal more, later on.

A touch of humour relieves the more serious aspects of the following incident. We are told that a certain Peter of Cagliari, a Jewish convert to Christianity, possessed of praiseworthy but somewhat undisciplined zeal, "having taken with him certain disorderly persons," on the very day after his baptism, placed in the synagogue an "image of the Mother of our Lord, and of the Venerable Cross, and the white vestment with which he had been clothed when he rose from the font." Considerable excitement having been, not unnaturally, caused by this proceeding, St. Gregory was appealed to, and ordered the sacred objects to be reverently removed; at the same time adding a little homily on the right and the wrong way to convert people to the Catholic Faith.¹

Proofs abound of Gregory's tender care for the conversion of Jews to the true religion. We, indeed, in this country, have reason to remember the missionary zeal of the great Pope who lost his heart to the bright-faced Anglian boys in the Roman slave market and who did so much to win England for the Church. But this zeal was not, so to speak, kept only for exportation, for while he sent his missionary priests to the ends of the then known world, St. Gregory cared no less for the Jews and others who were close to hand, and sought to help them by word and deed. A few sentences from his letters will reveal his anxiety for their conversion, and at the same time indicate the methods by which he thought it should be brought about.

"Those, then," he says, "who with pure intent desire to bring to the true Faith aliens from the Christian religion, should study kindness and not asperity, lest such as reason rendered with smoothness might have appealed to, should be driven far off by opposition." Again, "We shall . . . so act that being rather appealed to by reason and kindness, they may wish to follow us and not to fly from us, and that proving to them from their own Scriptures what we tell them, we may be able, by God's help, to convert them to the bosom of

¹ Ep. ix. 6.

Mother Church. Wherefore let the Fraternity, so far as may be possible, with the help of God, kindle them to conversion."¹

And, once more, "Moderation should rather be used towards them, that the will not to resist should be elicited from them, and not that they should be brought in against their will; for it is written 'I will sacrifice to Thee willingly,' (Ps. lviii. 8) and 'of my own will I will confess to Him,' (Ps. xxvii. 7)."²

It is stated in the Jewish Encyclopædia that St. Gregory offered material inducements to Jews to become Christians, and it is true enough that to Jewish converts with holdings on his own estate, the Pope remitted a small portion of their dues, himself giving the reason that such action might be an encouragement to others.³ But nothing is clearer than that he opposed anything like forced conversion or that he would never have consented to the reception of anyone into the Church whom he did not believe to be sincere in taking the step.

We find, further, that the Pope arranged that assistance should be given to the families of those who embraced Christianity, "lest," to quote St. Gregory's own words, "(as God forbid should be the case) they should suffer from lack of food."⁴

This, then, was the policy which St. Gregory handed down to his successors in the Mediæval Papacy—Protection of the Jews, and the promotion of a prudent apostolate amongst them, together with the placing of Christian interests first, consistently as we have already implied, with justice and charity to all.

These principles were never abandoned but, on the contrary, reaffirmed by successive popes. But it will be easily understood that their application will have varied according to circumstances. Passing over, for reasons of space, a series of pontiffs who exemplify the continuity of the policy in question, we will turn at once to its most considerable modification in practice under Pope Innocent III.

As we shall see, the, in some respects, greatest of Popes maintained the traditional Papal policy in this matter, but circumstances led him, in a considerable degree, to emphasize its repressive side.

¹ Ep. xlii. 12.

² Ep. ix. 6.

³ Epp. ii. 32; v. 8.

⁴ Ep. iv. 33

At Innocent's accession he seems to have been inclined to favour the Jews, and we have record of the "gratification," taking no doubt substantial form, received by them at his coronation.¹ But many things tended to modify the Pope's personal attitude. We can do no more than briefly mention some of these.

First, it appears that Christians were already suffering much at the hands of Jewish usurers.

Second, the Jews had secured much of the commerce of Europe and this often gave them a sinister power over their Christian neighbours. "It is scandalous," writes the Pope to the Count of Nevers, "that Christians should have their cattle slaughtered and their grapes pressed by Jews who are thus enabled according to their religious precepts to take unto themselves the ripe fruit, and leave the gleanings to the Christians." On another occasion Alphonso VIII. of Spain, who, like other sovereigns of the Mediæval period tolerated the Jews for his own material advantage, but otherwise was disposed to ill-treat them, is rebuked by the Pope for the protection he gave to the Hebrews in his dominions, a favour, based as we have just seen on no sound principle, often involving injustice to others, and differing very much from the reasoned protection always accorded them by the Holy See itself. "The synagogue prospers," cries the Pope, "and the Church decays. Take care, you, my eldest son in the Lord, how you attack the liberty of the Clergy and exalt the Synagogue and the Mosque at the expense of the Church and the Spouse of Christ." And we read further that, when the Spain of Alphonso IX. lay under interdict from 1198—1204, "even the Clergy were reduced to be the domestics of Jews."²

Third, there were the evils connected with the holding by Jews of Christian slaves. In addition to the reason against this custom given by St. Gregory, it is admitted by the late Mr. Abrahams in his "Jewish Life in the Middle Ages," that the Church "had good reason for her solicitude in this matter since a Jew could not retain in his home an uncircumcised slave." On the material side the treatment of their slaves by the Jews seems to have been generally mild and kind. This was only carrying out the Jewish Law as expressed, for instance, in the "Shulcham Aruch" of Rabbi

¹ Luchaire, "Innocent III." Vol. "Rome et l'Italie," p. 23.

² *Ib.* p. 31.

Joseph Karo, regarded by Orthodox Jews as the most authoritative codification of the Talmud. The Rabbi, quoting earlier authorities says: "Mercy is the mark of piety, and no man may load his slaves with a grievous yoke. No non-Jewish slave may be oppressed; he must receive a portion from every dainty that his master eats; he must be degraded neither by word nor act; he must not be bullied nor scornfully entreated; but must be addressed gently and his reply heard with courtesy!" But all this, although creditable to Jewish masters, naturally only made the spiritual danger to which a Christian slave was exposed more great.

Fourth, to Innocent as custodian of the True Faith the further fact that the Albigensian heresy had its origin, in part, at least, in friendly intercourse between Jews and Christians would have seemed, rightly, to be a further call for repressive measures. The fact, again, is admitted by Abrahams and also by Graetz and must be regarded as beyond dispute. "The Albigenses," writes Graetz, "had imbibed their hostility to the Papacy from intercourse with educated Jews";¹ and again, "amongst the Albigenses there was a sect which unhesitatingly declared the Jewish Law preferable to that of the Christians." Nor was this the only error in which, rightly or wrongly, Jewish influence was traced. The Jews were thus regarded as the natural allies of heterodoxy, and, as has been well said, "experienced the *contre-coup* of its suppression."

Fifth, the Pope complains also that the Jews had violated the decrees of the 3rd Council of the Lateran. But, finally, perhaps nothing weighed with him so much as a motive for the repressive measures which we are shortly to describe, as the grave moral danger resulting from social intercourse between Christians and Jews, taken in conjunction with the fact that, quite rightly, marriage between members of the two faiths was forbidden by the authorities of Church and Synagogue alike. That this danger was no merely theoretical one, and that it was recognized and legislated upon by the heads of both religions, may, once more, be seen in the candid and carefully documented pages of Dr. Abrahams. We need not discuss his contention that Christians needed checking in this respect more than Jews. It does not affect the present point which is that danger undoubtedly existed—

¹ Vol. III., p. 517.

a danger of perversion, if forbidden marriages took place, and of immoral conduct if they did not.

All this forms a dark picture; but it must be remembered that it represents only one side of the facts. In all ages the inner life of orthodox Jewry has gone on in much the same way,—in many respects an admirable and edifying way resting on the foundations of its strong and characteristic family life. The mass of the Jewish people at the time of which we are now speaking, although they did not love their Christian neighbours, would have wished, for the most part, to have lived their lives undisturbing and undisturbed, while, higher up the social scale there had been, and were yet to be, striking literary friendships between Christians and Jews, flourishing chiefly in Italy itself. Such was the intimacy between Abbot Nilus and the Jewish physician and scholar Donnolo in the tenth century, and later on in the thirteenth, that between Dante and the Jew Immanuel of Rome.

We must now review briefly what may be called, but not quite accurately, the repressive measures of Innocent III. against the Jews. The most important of these are embodied in the decrees of the 4th Lateran Council and may be summarized as follows:

First, steps were to be taken to free Christians from the rapacity of Jewish usurers.

Second, Jews (and also, we may remark, Mohammedans) were to wear a distinctive sign.

Third, Jews were forbidden to go into the streets or to mock the Catholic ceremonies and blaspheme Christ at the time of the great Christian Feasts.

Fourth, Jews were not to be given public employment; and:

Fifth, Prelates were to see that Jewish converts did not continue to observe the rites of their former religion.

The only one of these decrees of which we need say anything further, is that which enacted the special Jewish sign, or badge. This, of course, was an effective item in this great Pope's general policy of, so far as possible, segregating the Jews, but the chief particular reason given for its introduction is that of the danger of social immorality, referred to above. The idea of the badge is said to have originated with the Mohammedans by whom it was imposed upon Christians, and who also enforced a distinctive dress upon the Jews within their power. While the 4th Lateran

Council enacted that the badge should be worn, it did not enter into details, which were settled usually by local governors and sometimes by the Jews themselves. In practice the badge was usually made of felt or cloth and more rarely of card, leather, or silk. Its shape was generally, but by no means always, circular, some seeing in this a reference to the financial pursuits of the Jews as symbolized by the shape of a coin, some to the thirty pieces received by Judas Iscariot as the price of our Blessed Lord's betrayal, and others to the Sacred Host which the Jews were held to have despised and insulted, and a kind of image of which they were now compelled to wear over their breast. Or it has been considered that the circular shape was devised more with the thought of its Mohammedan wearers in mind, in which case the circular form was supposed to be the antithesis of the crescent of Islam. But, after all, a circle is not an unnatural shape for a badge.

However, other forms existed as well, the shape varying to some extent, not only in different countries, but in the same country at different times. In England, for example, an oblong badge was enforced and later—in 1278—there was substituted for this one in imitation of Moses' two tables of stone. The colour was originally white, but in this country was altered by Edward I. to yellow. In France it was parti-coloured. An extension of the whole idea, and a good example of the way in which the un-Christian sentiments of some individuals could pervert the Pope's intentions and—to some extent—bring discredit on the Catholic name, was the hideous hat (*Judenhut*) which Jews in Austria were compelled to wear. This hat was generally red, and was pointed at the top with the brim often twisted into the shape of a pair of horns.

The age at which the badge became compulsory was in some places seven, in others thirteen for boys and twelve for girls. Later, at Avignon, it was raised to fourteen for boys. While the Council imposed the badge, its enforcement by penalties, as Dr. Abrahams admits, was undertaken by the secular authorities on their own initiative. Encouragement was given to informers, who received as a reward the garment upon which the badge had not been worn.

The policy of isolation of the Jews pursued by Pope Innocent III., was no departure from the principles of Papal policy initiated as we have seen by St. Gregory the Great,

for it was covered by the fourth of those principles—the placing of Christian interests in the first place. It did, however, stress that aspect of the matter and apply it in a special way. While, as we have seen, the Pope commenced his reign in a spirit favourable to the Jews, he does seem to have conceived a dislike for them later, no doubt inspired by the danger to Christendom which he saw in their activities, as developed in his age. His policy must have had some good results from that point of view, and, even from the standpoint of the Jews themselves it may be questioned whether, speaking on natural grounds, they would have avoided assimilation, or possibly extermination, under other circumstances. But there were other consequences which we may rightly deplore. From this moment began the cultural deterioration of the Jews in the West, and the development of many of those less admirable characteristics which we are so apt to associate with the name Jew to-day. And the withdrawal of the influence of Jewish culture upon the European world was, in many ways, a thing to be regretted too. The philosophy which so greatly influenced St. Thomas himself; the almost unrivalled medical knowledge and skill of the Jewish physicians of Spain, Italy, and elsewhere, and other cultural features were lost or weakened. And, of course, there grew up among the Jews a spirit of resentment and suspicion, the effects of which are not entirely obliterated even to-day.

Yet, as we have said, all the elements of St. Gregory's policy in this matter are to be found in that of Innocent as well. The Jews were to be protected against forced Baptism, and in spite of their failure to recognize the fulfilment of their own law, "we extend to them," says the Pope, "the shield of our protection." This protection was exercised especially in view of the popular fury against the Jews at the time of the earlier Crusades. No one, under pain of excommunication is to harass them on their feast day, or on such days to compel them to do any work which can be done at any other time, or to force them to change their customs without legal judgment. Nor was Innocent less anxious than his predecessors for the conversion of the Jews. An illustration of this is found in a letter to the Bishop of Autun in 1199 where the Pope commands that kindness shall be shown to Jews who have been recently baptized and succour given them, "lest because of the reproach of poverty which they have not been accustomed to endure, they may be forced to

look back to the Jewish error which they have left."¹ In a similar strain he writes to the Archbishop of Sens, with reference to a striking conversion, resulting, apparently, from a miracle in connection with the Blessed Sacrament. Help is to be given "since this new plant is to be watered not only with the heavenly dew of doctrine, but also nourished by temporal benefits."²

The practical attitude of the popes to the Jews underwent little change during the remainder of the thirteenth century. To multiply further illustrations of a consistent policy is unnecessary. Nor does space permit us to wander into the tempting bypaths of such special questions as the attitude of the popes to the Talmud; the compulsory attendance by Jews of sermons preached for their benefit; and the establishment of the Ghetto at the very end of the period with which we are dealing here. Underlying apparently oppressive items of policy was sometimes the motive of protecting the Jews themselves. Nor can we do more than mention such entirely beneficent measures as the intervention of the popes to moderate the severity of the Inquisition; their denunciation of the infamous Ritual Murder charge; and their encouragement of Hebrew scholarship and research.

We have tried to show that a consistent papal policy towards the Jews existed, and to give a tolerably clear idea as to what the nature of that policy was.

FRANCIS DAY.

¹ *Regesta*, ii. 206.

² *Ib.* xvi. 84.

AN ANGLICAN ATTACK ON THE BIBLE

THE Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has recently issued a large volume of some sixteen hundred pages entitled *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*. Of the editors, who are three in number, Dr. Gore has acted as general editor, Canon Goudge as New Testament editor, and the Rev. A. Guillaume as editor of the Old Testament and the books which Protestants style apocrypha. The contributors are over half a hundred in number, among them being Dr. Burkitt, Dr. Lowther Clarke, Edwyn Bevan, Professor Margoliouth, Dr. Oesterley, Dr. Darwell Stone, Dr. H. St. John Thackeray. Each writer is solely responsible for his own opinions, yet, as we are informed in the preface, the contributors "are almost all united in their general point of view." This is evidenced in the book itself, and we shall not be in error in supposing that all are in favour of the main lines on which the commentary is planned.

Its appearance has been hailed with jubilation in certain quarters of the Church of England. A writer in the *Church Times*, Nov. 30, 1928, p. 649, emphasized the fact that the three editors have a common initial by writing: "It is unquestionable that this book is a Great Book, a Good Book, and that it will minister Grace to the readers (*sic*)."¹ He considers that it is an "extraordinarily great achievement." And again, "We repeat that this New Commentary is in every way a wonderful production." What is the outstanding characteristic of the commentary that is thus enthusiastically welcomed by the High Church organ of the Anglican Establishment? It is its frank rejection of the traditional Anglican belief in the inerrancy of the Bible. As Professor Burkitt remarks, "the old Protestant orthodoxy regarded the Bible as everywhere literally true."¹ The moderns have travelled far from this position. It is now maintained that the Bible enshrines fables, myths, folk-lore, not to speak of errors, historical and scientific. Sometimes, at least, the text does not even convey a moral or spiritual lesson. Thus Professor Burkitt says of Balaam's oracles: "It is inspiring to read such

¹ The Catholic doctrine of course is that the Bible is everywhere true in the sense intended by the individual sacred writer.

full-throated patriotic verse, but when we look, as we do elsewhere in the Bible, for the moral lesson, it simply is not there" (p. 421). So not only has the writer, whom we are accustomed to style sacred and inspired, attributed to Balaam words that he never uttered,—“no non-Israelite could ever have written these stirring Hebrew lines” (*ibid.*),—but has not even been concerned to give his fiction a moral lesson. It was after reading passages of this kind that the present writer was impelled to glance back at the title-page to see if the adjective “holy” does really there appear in conjunction with “Scripture.” It does. And yet the collection of Old Testament books is considered to contain non-religious and even pagan matter. It was apparently by error that it attained its sacred character. The reader might be inclined to doubt whether this view is really put forward in a professedly Christian commentary. Here are Professor Margoliouth’s words: “If the Old Testament had been regarded as the national literature of the Israelites, there would be nothing surprising in its containing non-religious or even pagan matter. It came, however, to be regarded as a sacred book, of purely religious content, whence the Canticles had to be fitted into that scheme” (p. 416). The Old Testament “came to be regarded as a sacred book,” apparently by error or misunderstanding! In the Professor’s thought it was not, and should not have come to be regarded as sacred.

It will help to a clearer understanding of the nature of this remarkable commentary to take some concrete examples. Thus (p. 38), “the records of Genesis are to a large extent legendary in character”—clearly the modern Protestant orthodoxy does not regard the Bible as everywhere literally true. But notice the reason alleged: This “is only natural since they go back to remote antiquity and were handed down orally through many generations before they were written.” We may agree that this is natural, but it is certainly not supernatural, as the Catholic Church has always taught the Bible to be. Does the writer then suppose that Almighty God could not have preserved these traditions correctly, or could not have guided the sacred writer to select from among the traditions to hand those elements which corresponded with objective fact? Again, the projected sacrifice of Isaac “may be regarded as a prophetic *midrash* of the 8th century B.C. intended to teach that Israel’s God does not require human sacrifice,” that is, as a pious fiction based on the higher teaching of the prophets. The opinions of the “sacred” writers

carry little weight with the authors of this commentary. The origin and meaning of the Passover "are explained in Ex. 12 and Dt. 16, 1-8. According to these passages, the feast was instituted on the eve of the Exodus." In spite of this, we are told that "it is doubtful whether this is the real explanation of its origin" (p. 75). It is not even considered necessary to adduce any reason for rejecting the word of the Biblical writers. We read in the Bible that God destroyed the first-born of the Egyptians on the night of the Exodus; but your commentator knows better,—“a plague which was the immediate occasion of the Exodus and perhaps particularly fatal to children became, under the influence of the Israelitish custom of dedicating the firstborn, one which spared the first-born of Israel and destroyed all the firstborn of Egypt.” So we are expected to take the word of a writer living more than three thousand years after the event against the word of one whom his corrector presumably believes to have been “inspired,” whom at any rate the corrector believes to have written from tradition within a few centuries of the event, and whom all until recently believed to have been a contemporary and eye-witness.

It is hardly necessary to multiply examples of this procedure. The later historical books share the same condemnatory verdict as the Pentateuch. At best, “in the later history of the divided kingdom the actual facts are again seen partly through a mist—the mist of later ideas as to how things ought to have happened, and therefore, it is supposed, must have happened from the prophetic or priestly point of view” (p. 187: note of the editors). The view taken of the historical facts recorded in the New Testament is more favourable on the whole; but this is on purely natural grounds, and not from any theological reason. In other words inspiration is not held to render the New Testament immune from error any more than the books of the Old Dispensation. Indeed, the Gospels are said to contain mistakes, even pious legends, “It is possible that the story of the Magi is, at any rate in part, a Christian *midrash* rather than authentic history, though the compiler of the Gospel may not have recognized its true character” (N.T. p. 132). “If it is the evangelist’s meaning that the miracle [of the coin in the fish’s mouth] actually took place, we can hardly accept his story” (N.T. p. 171). And so on.

In the midst of matter such as this it strikes the Catholic reader as incongruous to come across an occasional reference

to "the sacred text," or "the inspired writer." What inspiration means for the band of scholars whose work is here given a home within the same covers, it is impossible to discover from the commentary. One thing it does not imply and that is inerrancy. This doctrine once rejected, the commentators are satisfied with very flimsy reasons for disputing the historicity of the sacred narratives. Of the stater in the fish's mouth mentioned above, we are further told: "The fact that the miracle is not reported to have taken place seems to confirm the idea that Our Lord's words were not meant seriously. . . . It seems contrary to Our Lord's self-imposed limitations for Him to use miracles for the supply of His own personal needs." This begs the question of the purpose for which the miracle was worked, and also overlooks the obvious truth that we must learn the purposes of Christ in His miracles from the consideration of the miracles themselves, and not use our own idea of His purposes as a criterion by which to judge the historicity of the narratives presented to us by the Evangelists. Let us take one other example. Three reasons are adduced for doubting the historicity of the Visit of the Magi. "The summoning of the Sanhedrin is most improbable, since any scribe could have answered Herod's question" (cf. Jn. 7, 42). In the first place it is quite unscientific to reject a story because of its improbability. Many improbable things do actually happen, an elementary truth of which unfortunately our learned Biblical critics seem profoundly ignorant. In the case before us, did Herod know that any scribe could answer his question? If he did not, there is nothing strange in his summoning the Sanhedrin. And even if he did, the matter was so important in his eyes, touching as it did the possession of the throne, that he may well have desired to have the most authentic information obtainable. He would have thought it safer to trust the official answer of the Sanhedrin rather than the word of one scribe, possibly in league with some anti-Herodian party. Thus a moment's reflection shows that so far from being "most improbable" the course ascribed to Herod was just that which he would naturally be expected to follow, in order the better to consult his own safety. The second reason is equally unconvincing: "not only was no guidance to Bethlehem thereafter necessary, but v. 9 seems to involve ignorance of the nature of stars." The star was not necessary to guide them to Bethlehem, but it was necessary to assure them that they were doing right in pursuing the way to that city, and besides to assure them of the identity of the child

they were come to adore. Our commentator does not seem to realize that this star was not one of the indefinitely remote orbs beyond the solar system but some luminous appearance sufficiently near the earth to denote direction and locality. The third reason is no more valid than its fellows. "The story is difficult to reconcile with Luke, who in 2, 39 seems to imply that the Holy Family returned to Nazareth immediately after the Purification." A difficulty in reconciling the accounts in two Gospels is no reason for rejecting the historicity of either. Only the impossibility of reconciliation (if that were certain) could justify that course. In the present instance, the difficulty exists only for those who are unacquainted with the style of ancient Jewish writers which is often elliptic, and is far removed from the fullness and precision loved of Westerns. In other words St. Luke without warning his readers passes over a period of time. Similar instances would not be difficult to find. This example will enable the reader to judge for himself what is often the scientific value of the much vaunted modern scholarship that is said to have rendered a belief in the inerrancy of the Bible impossible. Often a difficulty is of the "critic's" own fabrication.

If the members of the Anglican communion as a body are willing to discard "the old-fashioned conception of the historicity of the Old Testament Scriptures" (p. 187, note of the editors), and to allow themselves to believe that the early chapters of Genesis are folk-lore, and the stories of the patriarchs legend and so on, will they be content to go on listening to the Old Testament read out in the Churches? Dr. Darwell Stone thinks not, without some qualification. "The Church is not likely to be able to retain the reading of the Old Testament and the recitation of the psalter in public worship, unless the use of mystical interpretation is to some extent recognized" (p. 695). However, "the editors cannot identify themselves at all fully with this anticipation" (p. 187). None the less the decay of Bible reading which of late has been deplored so often in the Press, is undoubtedly largely due to the spread of the very ideas which this commentary is doing its best to popularize, and in the opinion of the present writer the commentary, so far from stimulating study of the Scriptures will in the measure its views are accepted by the public, be a deterrent to religious and devotional reading of the sacred text; and it is surprising indeed that the *Church Times* can allow itself to be so far deluded as to write: "the new commentary will rapidly prove its immeasurable and indispensable utility to

the cause of religion and sound learning" (Nov. 30, 1928, p. 649).

The Catholic reader will be amazed to find that Dr. Gore¹ in his introductory essay expresses the opinion that the treatment to which the Bible is subjected in this volume is in harmony with the views of the Fathers, and that authority may be found in the ancient Church for the opinion that the Bible may contain error. The truth is that no doctrine is earlier or more authoritatively taught by the Fathers than that of the inerrancy of Scripture. The reason of this is clear. The Fathers believed that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and that God is their author, and as God Almighty can neither deceive nor be deceived, He can be the author of nothing that is false and erroneous. From this it does not follow that the Bible narrative is written with the highest degree of historical precision. It does follow that the sacred books contain nothing that is false in the sense intended by the sacred writer. Already in the first century St. Clement speaks to the Corinthians of the "sacred Scriptures, which are true and (given) through the Holy Spirit" (Epist. 1., 45). In the middle of the next century St. Justin in his *Dialogue with Trypho* (n. 65), speaks in the most emphatic way: "I shall never be so rash as to think or say this (viz., that one text of Scripture could be contradictory to another); but if any text which appears such is adduced and has the appearance of contradicting another, being entirely persuaded that no text is contrary to another, I shall admit rather that I do not myself understand the passages and I shall strive to bring to the same mind those who suppose that the texts are contradictory." These words of the Philosopher-Martyr anticipate closely the expression of St. Augustine's faith to be cited immediately. At the turn of the century St. Irenæus in his work *Against Heresies* (2, 28, 2), admits there are difficulties in the Scriptures we may not be able to solve, but for such we should put our trust in God "knowing for certain that the Scriptures are perfect, since they are the utterances of the Word of God and His Spirit." St. Epiphanius is equally emphatic. In the second half of the fourth century he wrote

¹ To do him justice Dr. Gore has made no secret of the fact that he is a rationalist in regard to the Scriptures. Three years ago he declared in a lecture (*Church Times*, March 12, 1926), speaking of the facts of revelation in the New Testament: "The judge of such facts is historical science." That is, man's mind is the sole measure of the truths recorded in the New Testament, the only reasonable attitude in one who rejects the teaching authority of the Church.

in his book *Against Heresies* (70, 7): "Nothing is at variance in the divine Scripture, neither can a text be found in opposition to another." St. Augustine defines the attitude of mind a Christian should have in face of a text which appears to be in contradiction with our certain knowledge. In a letter to St. Jerome at the beginning of the fifth century (Ep. 82, 3) he writes as follows: "It is only to those books of Scripture which are called canonical, that I have been taught to pay this deference and honour that I most firmly believe that the author of no one of them was guilty of any error in his work of writing; and, if in those books I should light on anything which appears contrary to the truth, I shall have no doubt but that either the manuscript is faulty, or the translator has not correctly seized the thought of the original writer, or I have not understood." This was the fixed faith of the great Doctor, and may be found set forth also in his work *Contra Faustum Manichæum* (11, 5).

For the Fathers, then it was a doctrine of faith that the Bible is free from all error, that its every text, understood in the sense intended by the inspired author, is necessarily in conformity with the truth. In the commentary before us it is laid down that "the very character and claims of the Biblical narratives demand that they shall be . . . subjected to the most stringent enquiry in the light of all the available evidence" (pp. 659f). The idea evidently is that the truth of Scripture is to be put to the test, and admitted or rejected according as it may appear to stand a searching scrutiny. As is clear from the words of the Fathers quoted above this was not their attitude. They knew that no scrutiny could detect error in the Bible, but their faith did not rest on such a scrutiny. Faith never can or could; for if our belief in the inerrancy of Scripture depended on an examination of its contents, which we found to be in harmony with our other knowledge, how could we be sure that some future discovery would not prove to contradict the Bible? The immunity of the Bible from error is one of the points on which the doctrine of the early Church is most clear; yet Dr. Gore thinks he can show that the great St. John Chrysostom held a contrary opinion. "We treasure," he says, "St. Chrysostom's admission of minor contradictions in the Gospels" (p. 15b). One wonders whether Dr. Gore has read the Saint whose authority he invokes. The heresy he attempts to father upon him he explicitly repudiates. The reference given by Dr. Gore is to the homily on St. Matthew i. 2. The Saint does there lay

stress upon the apparent discrepancies on minor points which are found in the Gospels. He rightly considers them to be corroborative evidence of the truthfulness of the evangelists, as showing that they wrote without artificial agreement. He says explicitly that the varying methods of expressing themselves used by the evangelists on questions of time and place in no way detract from the truth of their narratives. It is abundantly clear that he does not contemplate anything except apparent discrepancies. It is only of such seeming contradictions that it can be said that they do not affect the truth of the narration. Dr. Gore is treasuring, not an admission of the Saint, but an illusion of his own. If Dr. Gore will turn up St. John Chrysostom's homily on the paralytic let down through the roof (Migne, P.G. 51, 53), he will find that the Saint regards the opinion that the evangelists are in real opposition as the opinion of heretics. Speaking of pagans, Jews, and many heretics he says "they all accuse the evangelists of being at variance with and contradicting one another," and adds "It is not so. God forbid!" He lays it down that it is one thing to use different expressions and quite another to use contradictory ones. The former are found in the Gospels, never the latter. He gives as an example of his meaning that one evangelist says that Christ carried His Cross, whereas another says it was carried by Simon of Cyrene. "And how is 'to carry' not contradictory to 'not to carry'? Because both happened. When they left the praetorium, Christ was carrying the cross; as they advanced, Simon took it from Him and carried it." "Again in the case of the thieves," says St. John, "one evangelist says that they both blasphemed Christ, another that one rebuked the other who was accusing Christ. But neither is there a contradiction here. How is that? Because here also both happened; and at the beginning both thieves acted wickedly, but afterwards . . . one of them repented." It is rather pathetic that Dr. Gore should be treasuring as the belief of St. John and finding the support of his own attitude to the Word of God in an opinion that St. John Chrysostom attributes only to pagans, Jews, and heretics.

Dr. Gore is equally in error when he writes that "Tertullian also points out that St. Paul does not always appear to be writing under inspiration" (p. 15b), though here he has been misled by following Dr. Sanday. In his *De Exhortatione castitatis* n.3 Tertullian refers to 1 Cor. chap. 7, where St. Paul writes: "I speak this by indulgence, not by command-

ment. . . . But to them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth. . . . For to the rest I speak, not the Lord." But there is nothing here in either St. Paul or in Tertullian about the inspiration by which Scripture is the Word of God. St. Paul was equally inspired to write that he himself spoke one thing by indulgence, that the Lord commanded another, that he spoke to the rest, not the Lord. One part of Scripture may contain more revealed truth than another; some parts may contain none at all. But revelation and inspiration are two entirely different things, though not distinguished by some of our Anglican friends.

Mistaken notions are largely responsible for the present revolt from the Bible. Protestants held a theory of strictly verbal inspiration, and of the literal truth of every part of the Bible, for example, of Genesis, chap. 1, where the literal truth was not intended. Realizing the exaggeration and even falsity of these ideas, and having no fixed principles to afford guidance, they have now allowed the pendulum to swing its full length and have utterly abandoned the inerrancy, and to all intents and purposes the inspiration, of the Bible. Clergymen of the Establishment have long entertained these liberal notions, though it appears that they have been sparing of giving them publicity in the pulpit. But now, says the *Church Times* in a leader (Dec. 14, 1928, p. 709) "the whole matter has been taken once and for all out of the study and the lecture room into the homes of the people"; and, as it proceeds, "The more highly educated and professional classes are now free to discover that the faith of the English Church is a rational faith," it rather suggests that it has hitherto been felt wise to keep back these liberal notions as a kind of esoteric knowledge. However this may be, "there is no sort of doubt whatever that at last the theological lessons of the last thirty or forty years have gone home." And because this volume makes this abundantly plain, its publication marks a milestone on the road pursued by the Church of England. It is a mark of a definite break with the past, and of the adoption of one position the more that the early Church knew to be against the faith. St. John Chrysostom, Dr. Gore's treasured champion, has shown it.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BIOGRAPHY

IN no form of literature is modern psychology exercising a profounder influence than in biography and autobiography, for the reason that, from the very nature of things, that type of literature is concerned with character study, the intimate revelation of personality. M. Paul Bourget tells¹ us that the ancients were so taken up with action that they scarcely knew of this dangerous spirit of analysis, finding no delight at all in the minute and astonishing contemplation of what passed within them. He holds that this self-analysis has been developed largely by the Catholic practice of confession, and that it is to satisfy a natural appetite for confession that many moderns, of all and of no beliefs, have contracted the habit of the "intimate journal," which the ancients would have found incomprehensible.

Catholic, then, at the root, the confessional method, the introspective, psychological biography, has branched out into two quite different stalks, the one profoundly Catholic, the other largely anti-Catholic or purely pagan.

Many Protestants and free-lance revivalists, by crying their spiritual experiences from the house-tops, have prejudiced against the method our average modern Catholic, whose practice, moreover, of secret confession has induced in him a spirit of reticence in soul-matters outside the confessional. Still, we must not forget that confessional literature has been in vogue during the whole history of the Church, from St. Paul, St. Augustine, St. Patrick, St. Theresa, St. John of the Cross, down to Cardinal Newman, St. Thérèse, and a score of famous moderns. Hence the method cannot be held discredited because it has been also adopted by Rousseau, George Moore, and their swarms of imitators in the cheap "confessional" magazines. The abuses connected with it makes us too readily inclined to regard it with disapproval, whereas the system may be of untold value for the revelation of spiritual wonders which would otherwise remain hidden forever.

Even to-day, from a Catholic point of view, the most striking and most encouraging feature of the psychological method is the remarkable interest it has aroused in the spiritual life of our great saints. Those who are most utterly

¹ "Essais de Psychologie," pp. 475-6.

out of harmony with what they deem the rigid, unpoetic formalism of the Church, are apt to be astonished to find on the very altars of the Church the Mystic Warrior Maid, and the Father of Romanticism, Francis of Assisi. For instance, Mr. Middleton Murry, the critic, is quoted by M. Abbé Bremond¹ as holding that Catholicism is like classicism: every priest a Boileau. Yet here he is inconsistent, for he has some acquaintance with Catholic mysticism, and indeed uses its experiences to explain his own philosophy of poetry.

The same brilliant Abbé Bremond, in his preface to "*L'Histoire Litteraire du Sentiment Religieux en France*,"² shows how the new psychology is applied to religious biography:

There are two methods of conceiving the history of religious literature. The first is to enumerate the principal religious writers of such a period or such a country, to describe their work, discuss the originality of each, his literary or philosophical merit. This is followed by most ancient and modern critics who study the Fathers of the Church or the Doctors of the Middle Ages . . . Newman among the English and Sainte-Beuve among the French have brought into honor another method, which is more moral or religious than literary. Erudition, pleasures of taste, joy of spirit; they refuse themselves none of these. But their direct object is to penetrate the religious secret of souls, of an Augustine, for example, or of a St. Cyprian, and the particular *nuances* of the secret. What was the intimate life, the favourite prayer, the personal reaction of these poets, these preachers, these devout authors, to the realities of which they speak: that is what people wish to know above all.

Sainte-Beuve has himself vividly described this psychological method alluded to by M. Bremond. He tells us how he had always loved the correspondence, the conversation, the thoughts, all the intimate details of character and the mannerisms of the great writers. Shutting himself up for a fortnight, for instance, with one man's writings, he would read and study him intently. Having first constructed a sort of mental skeleton of the man thus far revealed, he sought to build upon this, adding more and more traits as he discovered them in

¹ "*Prière et Poesie*," pp. 137-8-9.

² Vol. I. Avant. propos, p. v.

the self-revelations of the writer, for he placed the author before himself as a living person and questioned him at leisure. Gradually, then, from the vague, the abstract, the general, the character began to take shape; the true man became more and more clearly defined, accentuated, individualized. And the day he had captured the characteristic trait, the revealing smile, the indefinable something that made this personality essentially different from every other, analysis disappeared in creation. "The portrait," says Sainte-Beuve triumphantly, "the portrait speaks and lives; I have found the man!"¹

The majority of the popular biographies of the day are being written according to this theory of Sainte-Beuve. It is, for instance, the method of André Maurois in his lives of Shelley and Disraeli; it is the method of Ludwig in his biographies of Napoleon and Bismarck and, unfortunately, in that foolish experiment, the Son of Man; it is essentially the method of Lytton Strachey, of Paxton Hibben, and a score of others. According to this method, we are no longer to analyse mere lifeless matter; our operation is to be performed on living beings. If studying a poet or an artist, we no longer contemplate the masterpiece, but the master; we do not enquire of *what* the work was composed, but *how* it was composed. We no longer regard the bald, objective facts in the lives of public men; we study the men themselves, above all their interior life, their minds, their souls; for the method is psychological.

The result is frequently, however, not so much a biography as an historical novel; the writer must needs take an extremely subjective view of his character. The portrait he paints may or may not be exact, according to what he himself considers as the real crises in the man's life, to the amount of his own personality he imposes upon that of his character. For the new norm is his own heated imagination, rather than the bare, cold facts. To-day he is supposed to enter into his character and look out upon life from the character's viewpoint. The difficulty is that he is inevitably tempted to view life with his own eyes instead. Hence, many pretended modern biographies are really autobiographies.

To write a biography one needs to be a Boswell,

¹ Cf. "Evolution des genres dans l'histoire de la littérature," F. Brunetière p. 228.

[says John B. Watson¹] and even a Boswell can write only one biography. To grind "biographies" out two or three to the year on the basis of the flimsy records we have, even of living people—not to speak of those long dead—is a pedantic and humorous, if not commercial undertaking. Autobiographies are even worse, I don't see how anyone except a very naive person could write up his own life. Everyone has entirely too much to conceal to write an honest one—too much he has never learned to put into words even if he would conceal nothing. Think of chronicling your adolescent acts day by day—your four years of college—your selfishness—the way you treat other people—your pettiness!

Even those who do not aim to make a complete revelation, who insist not so much on isolated events in their character's life as on his personality, are constantly misleading the modern reader. While new discoveries in psychology have made biographers more cautious in accepting even documented human testimony at its face value, more determined to get behind the apparent and conscious motives to the real underlying causes of action, there is an enormous danger confronting them, as the temptation to pander to the popular love of scandals and revelations is almost irresistible to many weak brains and flowing pens. This defect is characteristic of a large proportion of English and American biographies since the War. Their authors, while claiming to be in search not merely of the truth, but of the whole truth, have often over-emphasized the more unsavoury elements in the lives of popular idols. Yet even here one should not make wholesale condemnations. The saner elements among readers and writers are interested, not in muck-raking, but in establishing without fear or favour the precise influence and the relative position of the subject dealt with among his contemporaries, believing that they have a legitimate right to ask, "Is this the man as he lived among his fellow-beings?" Again, it is not the use, but the abuse of the method, which is reprehensible.

In conclusion, it would seem that there is as much to be said for the new method if handled rightly, as to be said against it, when mishandled. Catholics, I repeat, may take no little comfort in the fact that the mystics who have tasted how sweet the Lord is, are to-day being scrutinized with the keen-

¹ "Feed me on Facts," *Saturday Review of Literature*, June 16, 1928, p. 967.

est interest the world over even by scientists, while everybody is writing and everybody is reading the lives of saintly heroes long since forgotten by all save Catholics. Henry Morton Robinson,¹ an American, recently urged that the new biographical method be applied to the saints, to portray them as great men and women as well as great saints. It is being applied to the saints, in Europe, if not yet so generally in America. St. Francis of Assisi, St. Vincent de Paul, St. John of the Cross, presented, not merely as saints but as great social figures, are thus quite the fashion even among educated Protestants. Few would dare to write the life of a saint to-day without devoting a considerable proportion to his mystic experiences. The recent fine biography of Ignatius of Loyola by the non-Catholic Princeton Professor, Van Dyke, is a case in point, while the enthusiastic reception accorded by all denominations to the life of Fr. William Doyle, S.J., the Irish mystic of our times, is a convincing proof of the widespread interest in this subject.

The saints have nothing to fear from new psychological methods, if rightly applied. Even the unenlightened and inexperienced handling of such outsiders as Mr. William James, in his "Varieties of Religious Experience," has provoked a more intelligent interest in those members of our race who have shown to what heights human nature can rise through commerce with the divine.

J. F. KEARNEY.

¹ *America*, March 10, 1928, pp. 538-9. The writer was probably unaware that a series of *Saints' Lives*, introduced by a volume on "The Psychology of the Saints" by Henri Joly, was begun as long ago as 1897, with the precise object of dealing with them psychologically, and is still being issued.

DOES SCRIPTURE DISPROVE THE ROMAN CLAIMS?

A CRITICISM OF DR. GOUDGE'S "THE ROMAN
CONTROVERSY."

CANON H. L. GOUDGE, D.D. is Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. As such, he is a person of considerable importance. He is also a leader of the High Church party, or at least of the Modernist section of that group of Anglicans. When, therefore, Canon Goudge expresses his deliberate views on what he calls "The Roman Controversy," he cannot be ignored. His published opinions on this subject deserve, as they invite, attention from "Romans" as well as from Anglicans.

In two recent numbers of *The Church Times* (November 30 and December 7), Canon Goudge has published verbatim a paper which he had "read before the Nicene Society at the Dominican Priory, Oxford, on November 13th." It should be explained that the Nicene Society is a Society officered by Oxford undergraduates—Catholic, Anglican, Nonconformist—who are interested in Theology, in which from time to time during term papers are read, ordinarily by distinguished graduates, followed by a general discussion. On the night of Canon Goudge's paper it was the turn of the Dominican Priory to furnish its hospitality to the Society—hence the connection, which will have puzzled many of the readers of *The Church Times*, between this very anti-Catholic argument and the home of the sons of St. Dominic.

At the end of his paper Canon Goudge said that he "welcomed the opportunity" to read it at Oxford, simply because those who listened to it had "heard so much on the other side." That this had been the case will be welcome news for the readers of THE MONTH.¹ He explained, however, at the beginning that he would "wish to speak, not like an advocate, but like a judge instructing a jury in a complicated case." It seems hard to reconcile this "wish" with the other wish "to answer the other side." Whatever may have been Canon Goudge's conflicting wishes, there is no

¹ It is interesting to know that the President of the Nicene Society, a Scholar of Corpus, who presided at Canon Goudge's paper and the subsequent discussion, was received into the Catholic Church on Christmas Eve.

room for doubt as to his performance. Notwithstanding its claim to impartiality it is manifestly, though not avowedly, *ex parte* and partisan. Throughout, there is an extraordinary understatement of the Catholic position, together with an affectation of fairness which only makes the understatement harder to understand. In conjunction with this neglect to set out, as a judge should set out, the real case of "the other side," we find a lamentable readiness to minimize the evidence even for such a fundamental truth as the Existence of God, if thus the Catholic claim to authoritative teaching may be weakened and discredited.

Canon Goudge starts the argumentative part of his paper by laying down magisterially that the real issue between Catholics, or as he would say, "Romans," and Anglicans is "the truth of the Roman claims." Here it is impossible for us to part company with him too emphatically. As, some fifteen hundred years ago, Optatus of Milevis, the contemporary historian of the origin of Donatism, impressed upon those heretics, the real, and indeed the sole question which has to be faced is this:

"Which is the Church, or where is to be found the One Church, which is *the* Church, because, besides the One Church, there is no other?" This question (as St. Augustine was soon to insist with much earnestness), includes all others in itself, because Christ commissioned His Church to teach with His authority. Once we have discovered: "where the One Church is to be found," we know that it is our duty to submit our minds to the teaching of that Church on all subjects concerned with the Divine Revelation, including those that are connected with what are specifically known as "the Roman claims."

It is, however, very remarkable that when this same St. Optatus turns to investigate the question—"Where is the One Church, called by Christ His Dove, and His Bride," having laid it down that it must be "Catholic, that is, spread throughout the world," and that it possesses what he terms "Endowments," or, as we should say, Notes, or Marks, by which it may be identified, he mentions as "*the first* of these Endowments," the holding of the *Cathedra*, (that is of the *Cathedra Petri*) at Rome.

We must see, [he writes to Parmenion, his Donatist adversary], who was the first to sit on the *Cathedra* and where he sat. If you do not know this, learn. If you do

know, blush. For one who knows, to err is to sin. Those who do not know may sometimes be pardoned. You cannot then deny that upon Peter first in the City of Rome was bestowed the episcopal *Cathedra*, on which sat Peter, the Head of all the Apostles, in order that in this One *Cathedra*, Unity should be preserved by all, lest the other Apostles might claim—each for himself—separate *Cathedras*, so that he who should set up a second *Cathedra* against the unique *Cathedra*, should be at once, a schismatic and a sinner. Well, then, on the One *Cathedra*, which is the first of the "Endowments," Peter was the first to sit.¹

St. Optatus proceeds to give a list of Roman Bishops from Peter "to whom succeeded Linus," up to Siricius, the Pope of the day, "who is now our colleague [in the Episcopacy] with whom the whole (Catholic) world through the intercourse of letters of peace, is united with us in one bond of communion."

As Optatus in the fourth century, so Catholic teachers in the twentieth, direct the enquirer after the true Church precisely in the same way. He insisted, as we do, that the Church of Christ is *One*, not divided; *Worldwide*, not local; *Apostolic*, not modern. And by Apostolic he meant exactly what we mean—in union with that Apostolic See whose present occupant is in lineal succession to its first, St. Peter. In other words, although ultimately we need only ask: "Where is the One Church?" still, Canon Goudge is right in his contention that "the Roman Claims" are of vast apologetic importance. If it can be shown that they are valid, then the true Church is to be identified, as Optatus taught, with the complexus of those local churches which are in communion with the Apostolic See of Rome, since such communion is an essential Mark of the Church of Christ. On the other hand, if, as Canon Goudge is of opinion, the Papal claims should be rejected as unwarranted, then there is an end, not only of the Catholic Church as centred to-day in Rome, but also of all dogmatic and institutional Christianity, since there is nothing left which can claim *divine* authority. Also incidentally, not only are Catholics wrong in the twentieth century, but also St. Optatus was wrong in the fourth century.

¹ Similarly St. Cyprian had already written: "Cum locus Fabiani [the Roman Bishop], id est cum locus Petri, et gradus *Cathedre* sacerdotalis, vacaret."

Was, then, Optatus wrong? Canon Goudge writes that he will "group the relevant considerations" for the consideration of this question under three heads. "First, there are the Biblical arguments; secondly, there are the arguments from the Fathers and Church history; thirdly, there are *a priori* and *a posteriori* considerations, potent in determining our attitude to the rest."

We will accept his "grouping," though exigencies of space will prevent us dealing with the matter as fully as we should wish, even though we confine ourselves for the moment to his first class of argument.

Canon Goudge then, sets out to show that the Bible discountenances Papal Primacy and the Unity so secured. Taking the Old Testament, he tells us that "the Old Testament is here far more important than is generally recognized," and startles us with the wholly unsupported statement, that "the Church, in the view of the New Testament writers, was not first founded by our Lord." One asks in wonderment which "New Testament writers" have expressed this "view" and where have they expressed it? Canon Goudge, indeed, states an undoubted truth when he avers that the people of Israel had been the Church of God before the coming of the Messiah and had prepared the way for the worldwide Church which was founded by our Lord on the first Whit Sunday. I should have thought that nothing could have been more manifestly "the view of the New Testament writers," and especially of St. Paul, than that the Church exclusively of Israel had been displaced by the Universal Church which was set up in the New Dispensation that it might penetrate to the ends of the earth, and that the Law, which was a schoolmaster to lead men to Christ, had given way to the Gospel. If Christ was not the "first founder" of the Church, what did He mean by reference to *His* Church ("My Church") which He declared that He would "build" upon His Apostle Peter?

Canon Goudge, however, instructs us that in "the divine purpose" (as distinct from its realization) "the Church before our Lord came was, in a true sense, 'One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic'—but owing to human sin not one of these 'Notes' was perfectly realized." This is a most remarkable statement—the express inference is that as these "Notes" were not "perfectly realized in the Old Testament, neither should we expect them to be in the New. The Catholic will at once

reply that there is no parity whatsoever between the two cases.

Christianity is developed from Judaism in the sense that it embodies the Divine Revelation given to the Jews somewhat as a finished painting is contained in the first rough sketch. St. Augustine's saying is well known: "*Novum Testamentum latet in Veteri.*" The New Testament lies hidden in the Old, it is true, but by no means can it be seen on the surface, for it is not there. The distinction between the two religions, for two religions in spite of their superficial continuity they are, is substantial in origin, objects and effects.

In whatever artificial sense it may be asserted that the Jewish Church was One, Catholic, Apostolic, it will hardly be maintained that this was the same sense in which Unity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity are predicated of the Church of Christ in the New Testament and in the Creeds. In the Creeds these "Notes" are given, together with the Note of Holiness, as the chief marks by which Christ's Church may be identified. In this article I leave on one side reference to the Note of Holiness—hoping to return to it on another occasion—because it is not so unmistakably clear as to what this Note precisely involves; but it will hardly be denied that "the writers of the New Testament" teach that the Church founded by Christ was to be One with a Unity like to the Unity of the Everlasting Godhead, or that it was a main purpose of the coming of Christ to gather the hitherto scattered people of God into a Unity (*ἐνς ἐν*); or that it was to know no distinction of race or social position, or even of sex; or that it was to persevere in "the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship" to the end. "I am with you all days," was said to the Apostles and in them to their successors. None of these things could be asserted for an instant of the Church of Jewry.

Nor is it easy to understand how the fact that Israel admitted "proselytes" even dimly adumbrated the great fact that in the Church of Christ there should be neither bond nor free, neither Jew nor Greek, neither male nor female; that within its borders the Chinaman or the Blackman should be as truly a citizen and at home as is the Italian or the Englishman. The people of God were merely "a people," not a worldwide Church.

It is true no doubt that there was a certain unity promised by God in the Kingdom of Israel, but we have no reason

whatever to surmise that it is likely to be achieved by the same methods in the Kingdom which the Divine Son should establish in the ends of the earth to last until He come to judge the world. Indeed since whatever was imperfect and transient in the type and figure will be made perfect and permanent in the reality, therefore, we should expect that the imperfect unity of Israel should be replaced, as in fact it has been, by the perfect Unity of Catholicism, which has no parallel amongst the works of men, and therefore manifestly is divine.

However, in the *Church Times*, Canon Goudge has in a footnote furnished us with references in proof of his statements concerning the Notes of the Jewish Church. These are:—"For Unity, cf. Is. xi. 11-13; Ez. xxxvii. 15-22: for Catholicity, Is. ii. 10; xlv. 22, 23; Rom. xv. 8-12: for Apostolicity, Is. xlii. 1, 6, 7, 19. I regret that the Canon contented himself with mere references. His hearers, had he quoted them in full, could not have failed to have been struck, as I have been, by their hopeless inadequacy for his purpose. As my readers may judge for themselves, there is no fixed divine purpose disclosed by Isaiah of keeping Israel united and yet dispersed over the world. The Prophet's words refer to the future Church of Christ as much as to the destinies of Israel. In the quotation from Ezechiel it is curious to note the prophecy: "And one King shall be a King over them all." Evidently the Prophet regards this coming event with satisfaction rather than with the deprecatory attitude of Canon Goudge. In any case readers will search in vain for Is. xlv. 32, 33, for that chapter ends with verse 25, whilst in the only three chapters which have more than 32 verses, there is nothing remotely concerning "Catholicity"—the tenth chapter which is concerned with "the woe of tyrants," the thirteenth which tells us of Tophet, and the thirty-seventh which deals with the relations of Hezekiah and Sennacherib. I think the Canon, having made this wonderful discovery of the anticipated disproof of the Roman Claims in the Old Testament should have been more careful to communicate it to those concerned. This he has not yet troubled to do.

Nor need I quote Canon Goudge's reference from the Epistle to the Romans, since it is concerned exclusively with the vocation of the Gentiles. It would almost seem that here again there must be another wrong reference.

How far, then, these quotations to which Canon Goudge makes his appeal, support his statement that: "In the Divine purpose Israel, the Church before our Lord came, was in a true sense One, Catholic, and Apostolic," I must leave my industrious readers to judge. Certainly there is nothing in them to justify the stress which he lays upon his argument that, because ordinarily there was no visible Supreme Ruler in the Church of the Old Testament, there will be none in the Church of the New. The assumption that God's ways with the permanent Christian Church will be the same as with the provisional polity of Israel is clean contrary both to likelihood and to historical fact.

After this somewhat ineffective display, the Canon complacently continues: "Thus in my capacity as self-constituted judge I should instruct the jury that the Old Testament gives no support to the Roman claims, and disposes of several popular Roman arguments," that is, as far as we can discover from his paper: firstly, that the Church of Christ is visibly One, Catholic, and Apostolic as stated categorically in the Creeds. This is "disposed of" by the supposed fact that the Jewish Church was also, "in the Divine purpose, One, Catholic, and Apostolic; but that owing to human sin not one of these 'Notes' was perfectly realized."

And, secondly, the Catholic doctrine concerning the Primacy of Peter and his successors is disposed of by the fact that there was no permanent "visible head in Israel," and that "when there was one, he proved sadly disappointing." In answer to this we repeat that there is no parity between the conditions formerly existing in the Old Testament days and those existing now. Before our Lord came, God frequently manifested His Will to His people by miraculous interpositions, so that, as Canon Goudge reminds us, when in Samuel's day Israel asked for a King, they were blamed for asking, since the Lord God was their king; whereas after the coming of Christ, all was to be completely changed. No longer were there to be these continual manifestations of the Divine Will, the Urim and Thummin, the Shekinah, the sending of Prophets and the like. "God at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past to the fathers of the prophets, but in the fullness of time He sent His Son." It was, indeed, mysteriously "expedient" for us that after a few short years amongst us He should withdraw His visible Presence from our midst. But the Gospel should be greater

than the Law. Our Lord would, therefore, leave a Church, which should be the heir of His Promises, uninterruptedly guided into all truth, manifestly and certainly One, World-wide, Apostolic. It is an unwarrantable perversity to look for light as to the government of this new Church elsewhere than to its Founder's clear and express declarations. Any analogies drawn from the Church of Israel can only be useful to point a contrast. We find the New Testament Church, the spotless Bride of Christ, fully described in nature, function, and government in the New Testament, elaborated by the tradition and teaching of the Church itself, as a conscious living organism, to be identified to-day by its conformity with that description. Canon Goudge does not hesitate to challenge this fact. Having "disposed of" our arguments, he examines the position of St. Peter.

Obviously, we cannot discuss this vast and very trite subject at any length in the pages of *THE MONTH*, but, if we allow Canon Goudge to state his own case, the extraordinary extent of his minimizing of the evidence will speak for itself.

What then, [writes Canon Goudge], is the position ascribed to him [that is, to St. Peter] in the New Testament? He is extremely prominent in the Gospels, and in the first part of the Acts, more prominent than Protestants have always been willing to admit. This is specially true of the Jewish Gospel of St. Matthew, and, though some of the stories there told of him may not be reliable, it is round the great figures that legends grow up.

We may interrupt for a moment our quotation from Canon Goudge to observe that here he has made it clear that we have described him with reason as a member of the Modernist group of Anglo-Catholics. For, once we grant of statements made in the Gospels that they "may not be reliable," but are possibly "legends grown up round a great figure," we have surrendered the whole position to the rationalist. Bishop Gore in his new Scripture Commentary, as is shown elsewhere in this issue, has "sold the pass," and Canon Goudge approves. This, however, is a digression, though it seems to me a digression of the greatest importance.

To continue our quotation from Canon Goudge:

What we find, [he writes—that is what we find in the Gospels, and specially in the Jewish Gospel of St.

Matthew] is a personal pre-eminence due to St. Peter's character, and not any official headship.

As we look at these words we gasp. Was it then, "due to St. Peter's character, and not to any official headship," that Christ declared, as we read in St. John's Gospel, when first He saw him, that He would bestow upon him the name Kepha "which being interpreted means a Rock"; that, so St. Matthew assures us, Christ gave him that name, declaring that *upon him* He would build His Church, that to him He would assign the Keys of Heaven, and the power to bind and to loose. Was it with no reference to any official headship that, as we read in St. Luke, Christ at a most solemn hour prayed for Peter specially that he might "confirm his brethren," or that immediately before He left the earth, He conferred, so St. John informs us, the supreme Pastorate—of feeding and of ruling—all His Flock? Or, to return to "the Jewish Gospel," was it because of his personal character that Peter was commanded to obtain—a miracle being worked for the purpose—the coin with which he might pay the tribute money "for Me and for thee," on behalf of the Kingdom of Christ on earth?

St. John Chrysostom calls this "the excess of honour" (τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς τιμῆς) bestowed by Christ upon Peter, but apparently it has no reference to "any official headship," any more than the fact that in the Gospels St. Peter is always separated from the Apostles—it is "Peter and those that were with him," "Peter, the first," "Peter and the rest"—or that Christ on His Resurrection sent a special message to Peter. "Go tell Peter and the others." It is the case that we find the reference to the miracle of the tribute money in St. Matthew's Gospel only, but St. John Chrysostom remarks that St. Mark did not relate this, because "St. Peter had forbidden him to narrate the great things concerning himself." If Canon Goudge really means that there is nothing "official" in our Lord's actions and sayings in respect to St. Peter, he presents a remarkably perfect specimen of the wish fathering the thought.

Our author declares further, in proof that Peter had no pre-eminence, that "even to the end of the Lord's life, the Apostles can dispute as to who is the greater." The fact is certain: but its interpretation may even enhance Peter's claim for, as St. John Chrysostom observes, when St. John

and St. James, shortly after the incident of the tribute money, asked our Lord, "Who is the greater?" "they did not do so indefinitely, but really meant to ask: 'Is Peter, then, the greater?'; remembering the 'Thou art Peter,' and the 'I will give unto thee the keys.'" As for the Canon's further point that "there is no proof that any authority is given to St. Peter which the other Apostles do not share," he is at one with Catholics in that belief. St. Optatus, for example, writes: "For the sake of unity, Blessed Peter both deserved to be placed before all the Apostles and *alone* received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven with power to communicate them to the others"—that is to *share* them with the others. This is Catholic doctrine. It is hard to know what travesty of Catholic doctrine Canon Goudge had in his mind when he tried to make that point.

Coming finally to the triumphant passage blazoned round the dome of St. Peter's, the Canon writes: "Neither the great Petrine text, nor anything corresponding to it, is found in the Gospels intended for Gentile Christians." By this, of course, is meant the Gospels of Mark, Luke and John. We shall expect nothing in St. Mark for the reason given by St. John Chrysostom, viz., that it is Peter's Gospel, and so avoids what stresses his great dignity. As for St. John I have already noted that it is he who wrote so much later, who tells us of our Lord's promise to confer the new name, the meaning of which St. Matthew explains. With regard to St. Luke's Gospel, perhaps I may be allowed to print again a combination of two passages, one from Luke xxii. 31, 32; the other from Matthew xvi. 18, which I drew out years ago and first printed in a book called "The Mustard Tree" (p. 145).

Luke xxii. 31, 32.

- 1, "Satan hath desired to have
you [the Church], . . .
- 2, but I have made supplication
for thee . . .
- 5, and do thou . . . establish
thy brethren."

Matthew xvi. 18.

- 3, and the gates of Hell shall not
prevail against it.
- 4, Thou art "Kepha," and upon
this "Kepha" I will build
My Church.

Is there, then, really nothing in St. Luke corresponding to "the great Petrine text"?

Of course, St. Paul is referred to, the writer going so far as to assert that St. Paul's references in his Epistles, "make against the Roman claims rather than for them." All this

is well-worn stuff, often refuted, but we may recall that in the Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul remarks that he "went up to Jerusalem to see Peter," the word *ἰστορήσαι* indicating as every scholar will know a visit to a person of importance. Nor is there anything in the famous "rebuke" by St. Paul to derogate from Peter's position. Because some of the New Testament books don't proclaim St. Peter's unique position, the Canon implies that they deny it: a fine but futile argument *ex silentio*. But he overreaches himself when he says "in no case when we have reached Gentile ground does St. Peter stand out from the rest." What about what we may call the elaborately staged reception by St. Peter of the first Gentile convert into the Church recorded in Acts x.? St. Peter was expressly chosen by Divine Providence to break down Jewish exclusiveness.

Canon Goudge sums up by telling us that he would "instruct" his jury, not, be it marked as an advocate, but as a judge, that Matt. xvi. 18 is "the only passage in the New Testament which, even *prima facie*, gives St. Peter any authority beyond that of the other Apostles." Well, we must leave it to the jury. The Catholic Church has had all the evidence before it for two thousand years, sifted, weighed, debated, by the greatest intellects of humanity. Canon Goudge does not agree with them. As he does not scruple to hint error in St. Matthew, why should he defer, say, to St. John Chrysostom? The foreman of the Canon's jury could not do better than quote the latter's words, "He puts into the hands of St. Peter the presidency over the Brethren . . . the presidency over His own sheep . . . and if anyone should say: Did not then James receive the Throne of Jerusalem?, I would answer that he appointed Peter teacher, not of that Throne, but of the whole world."

In a future issue of THE MONTH I hope to deal with the remainder of Canon Goudge's argument.

O. R. VASSALL-PHILLIPS.

THE EMANCIPATED CATHOLIC¹

THE Centenary of Emancipation finds us busily engaged in looking backwards to the state of the Church in England a hundred years ago in order the more thoroughly to realize our present comparatively happy condition and to be correspondingly grateful to Providence for our freedom. We are right in keeping in mind the days of bondage, for the sight of faith professed under difficulty and discouragement should be a stimulus to our own profession. If our forefathers, hampered by law and despised by public opinion, accepted so bravely the hard yoke of persecution and resisted so firmly the constant inducements to "conform," surely much will be expected from their descendants, who can give free play to the spirit of their religion and need fear little inconvenience from the full and public expression of their faith. It is a law in the spiritual life that more is required from those who possess more, that the removal of obstacles to progress should not be an excuse for laziness but a means for a more rapid advance. There is danger in circumstances which do not of themselves call for exertion: as soon as friction ceases there will be a diminution of heat (or fervour) unless it is maintained from some inner source. Accordingly let us humble ourselves by the contemplation of the spiritual destitution under which our Catholic ancestors lived Catholic lives for so many centuries, and wonder at the vigour of a faith which received so little spiritual or intellectual sustenance, whilst exposed to the enervating effects of a prevalent Protestant atmosphere, and yet maintained its strength and integrity. The Church of the past has many lessons for the Church of the present, and the prosperity of the Church of the future depends on the degree in which they are assimilated.

We suggested last month that the Act of April 13, 1829, did comparatively little for the Catholic religion as such: it was a measure of political emancipation, grudging and inadequate in extent, but still recognizing the fact that a Catholic could be a good citizen, and was not debarred by his creed from the protection of the law. The right to profess

¹ *Up and Doing: a Handbook of Catholic Action*, C.T.S. of Ireland. *Fortifying the Layman*, by E. R. Hull, S.J., C.T.S., London. *A Catholic looks on Life*, by James J. Walsh, Stratford Co., Boston, \$2.50. *Catholicism and the Modern Mind*, by Michael Williams. Longmans, 10s. 6d. net. *The Spirit of Catholicism*, by Karl Adam. Sheed and Ward, 7s. 6d.

the Catholic Faith was acknowledged in the Acts of 1778 and 1791 : for the gradual removal of other disabilities Catholics had to wait for many years after their political emancipation. There is but little left of legal discrimination against the Faith, except in the matter of education ; but, of course, with the bulk of the nation out of harmony with Catholic belief and practice, there is still an immense social prejudice against Catholics. The various forms of non-Catholic religion, socially tolerant of each other, unite in regarding Catholicism as the common enemy, whilst the large and growing number of "After Christians," who have abandoned belief in revealed and institutional religion, see from their detached standpoint that their only real adversary is the Catholic Church. In a world so constituted, to be a real Catholic is to be a soldier, fighting with those weapons which St. Paul calls "the full armour of God" (Eph. vi. 11). Not to fight evil conditions is to acquiesce in them : not to trade with one's talents is to bury them in a napkin : not to feel the yoke is a sign that one is not pulling. On the other hand, one rarely appreciates properly what one has acquired without effort : hence the "cradle-Catholic," born into a rich inheritance, is apt to think less of it than the convert who has won it through blood and tears. And there are always those whose spiritual faculties remain undeveloped, because they have lived by routine and been engrossed by externals, encountering no soul experiences to animate their faith, never realizing more than a fragment of its meaning. Hence the danger of the natural tendency to adopt the tone that is prevalent, the fear of being singular in opinion, unlike the herd, literally "egregious." There are mental fashions as well as sartorial, and not to be in the fashion is to court contempt. It needs strength of mind to bear witness to the Faith in an unbelieving age : rather, it needs divine grace thus to become a "martyr" to the unworldly spirit of Christianity. Singularly enough, one may adopt the most bizarre and nonsensical of non-Christian cults, and be applauded for originality and lack of convention : it is only adhesion to the authoritative supernatural religion of Christ, demanding obedience of mind and will, that moves the derision of the free-thinking world.

The main characteristic of that free-thinking world is its appalling ignorance of truth. When God, its Maker, dwelt in it, it failed to recognize Him, and it manages still to ignore the City-set-upon-a-Hill which He established to carry on His work. Like a cloud this ignorance of truth, both natural

and revealed, covers the whole non-Catholic world in varying degrees of depth. Yet the mind is framed to seek and lay hold on truth: no one really wants to be deceived; although many shrink from facing facts, still they know or suspect that the facts are there: strong desires or strong interests may tend to blind or distort the mental gaze yet it is only when masquerading as truth that prejudice can maintain its hold. If this natural desire to know, and to know aright, did not exist, education in its widest sense would be impossible and in particular the divine desire that all should "come to the knowledge of truth" (1 Tim. ii. 4) could never be fulfilled.

The main need of the world, therefore, is true knowledge of its own interests, and the main function of the Christian, trading with the talent entrusted to him, should be to enlighten the world. It was the claim of God-made-man that He was the light of the world, and He passed on this endowment to His faithful followers, exhorting them to display it before men. "Ye were once darkness," says St. Paul to the Ephesians, "but now light in the Lord." The whole Gospel glitters, so to speak, with this purpose of enlightenment, by the communication of true knowledge regarding God and man and their mutual relations. For that is the knowledge in which the world is woefully and culpably defective. "This is their condemnation," said Christ to Nicodemus, "that light hath come into the world, and men have loved darkness rather than light, for their deeds were evil" (John iii. 19). This blinding of conscience to the light in order that sin may be free from remorse is the desperate device of a creature equipped with the means of knowing obligation yet desirous to evade it with comfort. Accordingly the task of enlightenment has often to meet with positive opposition. People do not want their traditional notions upset nor to change their habitual point of view; especially if the process involves the sacrifice of something they value—self-esteem or the regard of others, possessions, position, influence. Truth has a hard battle to fight if various "vested interests" are opposed to it. But for a realization of the spiritual gains which truth secures—liberty from error, peace of conscience, nearness to God—many whose worldly welfare depends on their closing their eyes would never find strength to make the sacrifice.

Ignorance of human destiny make the meaning of life an insoluble problem and the conduct of life a series of futile experiments. No genuine Christian can doubt that man, in the words of St. Ignatius, "was created to praise, reverence

and serve God, his Maker and Lord, and by so doing to save his soul." The overwhelming importance of this end Christ Himself has emphasized. All that the world can offer is as nothing compared with it. Accordingly if the world is to be enlightened we must start by convincing it that it is not its own end but is merely the vestibule of another and permanent abode of immortal man. But even before that we must convince ourselves, practically, of the same momentous truth.

"If the salt lose its savour, wherewith shall it be salted?" Our Lord's question goes to the root of things. The bane of Catholicity is the worldly Catholic. The work of spreading the truth is paralysed, because the faith is so poorly illustrated by the lives of the faithful. If the world is in deadly ignorance of things that matter, it is because those who should know them do not, or knowing them, do not practise them. We are not really emancipated or fit to free others, till, rejecting the world's false guidance, we shape our lives by the truths of revelation. If the result of the political freedom, the beginnings of which were granted to us a century ago, has been to make us indistinguishable in aim and opinion from the non-Catholic multitudes around us, whereas our ancestors had the advantage, through their very disabilities, of being secured against such dangers, our emancipation may have brought us more harm than good. Of course, it is not so: a Catholic cannot really be one with the world, friendship with which means, according to St. James, hostility to God, and remain a Catholic. Many alas! do thus go over to the enemy—for some supposed advantage or through loss of belief in Catholicism,—but in general the claims of the Faith are enough to mark us off as a body whose final hopes and aims are in a world to come. However, if the bad Catholic actually hinders the progress of the Faith, the imperfect Catholic has in his degree a similar effect. Not to trade with our talents is culpable: much more blameworthy, therefore, is the misuse of them. Accordingly, the first endeavour of the Catholic, now politically emancipated, should be to increase his emancipation by increasing his knowledge of his Faith, and to share his emancipation by communicating his Faith to others. Editors often make the happy if obvious suggestion that, if each subscriber induced someone else to subscribe, their circulation would immediately be doubled: that being presumably a desirable result. Much more clearly desirable is it that each adult Catholic should, during Emancipation Year, convert,

or set in the way of conversion, some outsider. The possession of the Faith is in itself a call to the Apostolate—to be exercised, of course, according to one's degree and opportunity. But there must be few adult Catholics who have not non-Catholic friends, and amongst the latter, some few interested in religion. However, this Apostolate presupposes not only zeal but knowledge; knowledge of the unique and priceless treasure which the Faith constitutes, knowledge of the history of the Church, its guardian; knowledge in detail of its achievements in ministering to the material and intellectual as well as to the moral good of mankind. Such knowledge cannot be acquired without recognition, also, of the faults and failures of the human element in the Church, for nothing brings out its true supernatural character more than its maintaining itself in purity and vigour despite the defects of the *vasa fictilia*, the earthen vessels in which it is contained.

Many years ago Fr. E. R. Hull, S.J., a stimulating writer on moral and religious topics, lamented¹ the apparent ease with which even the educated laity tended to fall away from the Faith, and traced the phenomenon to "mental atrophy," a one-sided intellectual development which overlooked the immense interest of religious topics and concentrated on secular subjects. Newman at an earlier date (University Subjects; iv. §. 4), set forth in a well-known passage what the properly educated Catholic should know about the history of his Faith. Both writers were acutely conscious that the bulk of Catholics, having finished with the Catechism and the religious course at school, gave up the study of religion altogether, content to rely on an occasional sermon for further instruction in their Faith. The result inevitably was that such people, losing all taste for such unfamiliar food and devoting their activities to merely secular interests, could give no reason for the hope that was theirs and had to fly for defence against non-Catholic attack to their spiritual guides. Happily, within the last generation that attitude had been very largely abandoned. The spread of the Catholic Evidence Guild is one clear indication that the laity are realizing their obligations. The growth and range of excellent "apologetic" literature, from the pens of champions like Mgr. Benson, Frs. Knox and Martindale, Messrs. Belloc and Chesterton and many others, have provided instruction in history and dogma which is readable as well as solid.

¹ His booklet "Fortifying the Layman," may still be obtained from the C.T.S. (6d.) and is well worth studying to-day.

The Catholic Press, both weekly and monthly, has the exposition and application of the Faith always in view. The veteran Catholic Truth Society is busier than ever in putting Catholic theology, philosophy, history, and practice within reach of the minds and purses of the masses. The Catholic Encyclopedia forms an invaluable standard and storehouse of information. New series of cheap and well-written doctrinal booklets, like the "Calvert Series" in the States and "The Treasury of the Faith" at home, cater for a growing demand, whilst the dogmatic treasures of the *Summa* have been brought to the door of the English reader by the excellent Dominican translations. Finally, Catholic libraries in London, Liverpool, and other great towns make all this output easily accessible. When we contrast the meagre religious literature of a century ago with what is now to our hands we cannot but admit that for a Catholic to-day, with even moderate education and leisure, to remain ignorant of the beauties, glories, and utilities of his Faith shows a lamentable lack of the spirit of his profession.

Yet the rush of modern life is such, the floods of secular literature so overwhelming, the habit of reading and reflection so little cultivated, that it would not amaze us to find that the average eighteenth century Catholic had a deeper grasp of his Faith and a more real sense of responsibility in regard to it than his fellow of to-day. And this in spite of those multitudinous societies, the names of which crowd the pages of the Catholic Directory and the membership of which is, in almost every case, far short of what it should be. In April, 1927, there was inaugurated in London what was called "The Apostolic League," precisely to cope with this reproach. Its inspiration was due to the Catholic Missionary Society, that admirable organization which devotes itself especially to de-Catholicized England and which had the active concurrence of two other bodies with like object—the Guild of Ransom and the Catholic Evidence Guild. Its aim was expressed in a series of five undertakings, easy of fulfilment yet calculated to do a vast deal of good. They may be recalled here, for nothing could so befit the Centenary Year of Emancipation as a universal effort to carry them out. Members of the Apostolic League, accordingly, pledge themselves:

1. To increase their knowledge of the Faith, especially by private reading and by attending public instructions.
2. When prudence suggests, to answer questions and

objections and never through fear or shame to remain silent about the Faith.

3. To bring non-Catholics to Missions and Instruction Classes.

4. To provide them with suitable Catholic literature.

5. To pray for all non-Catholics and to offer Holy Communion for them at least once a month.

With those three Apostolic Societies at the back of it, a fruitful future should be before the Apostolic League. Although it took nearly a hundred years to complete Emancipation and to clear away the last legal disabilities which oppressed Catholics, the work has now been done, with the sole exception of the educational handicap, which, in effect though not in design, is penal. Whatever fetters still impede the activities of Catholics are self-imposed, due as we have said, to the infection of worldliness and to spiritual atrophy. It may be of interest to consider in this connection the revival of the spirit of Catholicism in a country which was also affected by the Emancipation Act and which like this had to struggle and wait long before it enjoyed its full benefits. We need not trace the influences which reduced the pre-dominantly Catholic population of Ireland to a condition of inferiority, political material, social, to a wealthy governing class, alien in race, religion and sympathy to those that they governed. When Ireland's separate nationhood was recognized, partially at least, by the Treaty of December, 1921, the effects of these centuries of subjugation still remained. Large numbers of Irish Catholics were still afflicted by what is called an inferiority complex. Leadership in literature and, to some extent, in social life remained in the hands of the non-Catholic minority; so much so that the chief daily paper is definitely Protestant, though maintained by Catholic support, and the literary coteries of the capital have no use for Catholics unless they apostatise. Against this abnormal state of affairs a vigorous reaction has begun, inspired by members of the Catholic Truth Society and by a later association called "The League of the Kingship of Christ." These bodies have in view the creation in the hearts of the Catholics of Ireland such an appreciation of the grandeur of their faith and such zeal for its promotion as to make the whole country as Catholic in sentiment and practice as it is in belief. The C.T.S. has issued a pamphlet called: "Up and Doing: a Handbook of Catholic Action," which, while mainly devoted to urging the Apostolate of the

Press, states the object of that Apostolate—"the strengthening of Irish Catholic Life" against the influences which make for its weakening.

Human nature itself is not helpful, rather the contrary. And its downward tendency is intensified immeasurably by almost the entire Press, newspaper, periodical, magazine and book : by the cinema and theatre ; often by the wireless, and frequently by utterances from public platforms. Against these forces—and they are persistent—the Church is arrayed. . . . There can be no neutrality : the "neutral" is an enemy. This profound truth should be well pondered by every Catholic (p. 2).

The Evil Literature Bill, now before the Dublin Parliament, is evidence of this re-awakening. It is a strenuous effort of the soul of Ireland to emancipate herself from the filth, native and foreign, that threatens to poison her. A truly Catholic life is impossible when the bulk of one's intellectual food is a practical negation of Catholic faith and morality. So far from being a meddlesome interference with proper liberty, the Bill is an endeavour to curb its abuse, in the interests of moral health. Its passing and still more its strict application will be a welcome sign that Christian civilization is reasserting itself in Ireland, although indeed not Christian morality as such but the code of decency imposed by natural law on all is in question.

Further off than Ireland, in a country where Catholics set an example of toleration long before that virtue secured reluctant admission to these islands, a similar efflorescence of the Catholic spirit is noticeable. The candidature of Governor Alfred Smith for the Presidency of the United States was a dramatic assertion of the compatibility of the Catholic Faith with civic duties. Nor do we consider that his defeat, engineered by religious bigots and determined on a variety of issues, was really a denial of that compatibility by a majority of American citizens. The existence, the energy and something of the true nature of the Catholic Faith were put vividly before millions of ignorant people and Mr. Smith's vindication of the reasonableness of his religion, equally aloof from puritanism and licence, was made more telling by the faddists and fanatics arrayed against him. The Church in the States, spread over a territory comparable in size to Europe, and composed of all European nationalities, has suffered in the past from want of cohesion, but, since the war, owing to the institu-

tion of the National Catholic Welfare Conference with its branch organizations, has gained greatly in influence and is served by a vigorous and outspoken Press, which is ever contrasting the Catholic's sound and stable ethical system with the moral chaos and corruption that exist outside the fold. No doubt it is true of America, as it has been true hitherto in this country, that as Newman wrote to Fr. Coleridge, S.J., in 1864: "Catholics are not a reading set," and the trouble there as here, is to excite in the faithful generally an appreciation of the religious and expository literature so abundantly provided. But the literature is there. America has the honour of having produced the first Catholic Encyclopedia in English. Another similar work of more extended scope, "Universal Knowledge," is at present being issued in New York. And if we may specify some modern works, well calculated to nourish Catholic zeal with knowledge, we recommend "A Catholic Looks on Life," by Dr. J. J. Walsh, a veteran writer whose industrious pen has filled many volumes with testimonies to the service which the Church has done to the world in every department of social, artistic, humanitarian, political existence. The perusal of this last volume, which is devoted to showing how Catholics, inspired by their faith, have been the pioneers in various sections of philosophy and science, as well as in the liberal arts, is eminently fitted to remove the last traces of that "inferiority complex" begotten of ignorance of history. Dr. Walsh bears honest testimony to the good faith, as well as to the prejudice, of many non-Catholics who in earlier days had no good word, but plenty of bad ones, for Catholics. The language of the Anglican hierarchy, for instance, a few generations ago, in regard to the Church, even Bishop Barnes or Dean Inge would blush to repeat. Abuse has ceased, appreciation may follow, but only if the truth, as set forth in this valuable book, becomes known.

Dr. Walsh deals mainly with our glorious past. Mr. Michael Williams, Editor of *The Commonwealth*, in "Catholicism and the Modern Mind," has in view the present and the future. He modestly calls his book a "bit of journalism," a propagandist collection of press-articles written at various times and called forth by very different episodes and personalities. Yet the setting of mystical devotion in which the book is presented—it was apparently put together during a sojourn at a Trappist Monastery in Kentucky—is wholly in harmony with the rest of its contents, for Mr. Williams tests everything by the enduring values of Christianity. The "Modern Mind"

in America is similar to that which afflicts us here,—only more crude and more thorough in its extravagancies—and of course the eternal principles of Catholicity, on the stability of which human society is based, are the same everywhere. The contest, which began in Paradise, is between Naturalism and Supernaturalism, and Mr. Williams sees in "The Present Condition of Catholics in the United States"—the title of one of the most arresting of his chapters—abundant reasons for hope of further progress, provided the laity realize and do their duty. As a member of the "Calvert Associates," a body of lay-folk organized for this purpose, and Editor of *The Commonwealth*, a weekly journal voicing their views, Mr. Williams is thoroughly well equipped both to estimate the situation and to suggest how the laity may advance the interests of the Faith. His book, ranging over all the religious issues in current controversy, is an assurance that American Catholics will not lack competent leaders in that great work. We may note that, if an essential part of the true Catholic's equipment is an appreciation and love of the liturgy, Catholics in America are ahead of us in organized efforts to disseminate the liturgical sense.

We conclude by recommending yet a third book as highly useful in giving Catholics a reasoned synopsis of their Faith, in all its perfection, together with a frank recognition of the imperfect realization of that perfection which has marked every age of the Church. We refer to Dr. Karl Adam's "The Spirit of Catholicism," lately translated by Dom Justin McCann, O.S.B. The book has had a deservedly great vogue in Germany for it stresses the divinity of Catholicity, the fact that the Catholic is by grace already a citizen of the world to come and amenable to its laws, whilst remaining in exile here. It upholds the uniqueness of the Catholic status, yet makes all allowance possible for *bona-fide* non-Catholics. It establishes the Catholic position historically, but does not conceal the blunders and crimes that have occasionally obscured the truth. It gives the requisite philosophical setting to our belief, enabling us to estimate the actually chequered course of the Church through the ages without losing sight of the designs of Providence.

We repeat once more that no Catholic is really emancipated who is in bondage to the spirit of this world, the world which loves vanity, or ignorance, and seeks after lying. Knowledge of the Faith is an essential prerequisite to this moral emancipation. The proper study of mankind, whether here or in eternity, is God.

JOSEPH KEATING.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

A GUILD OF CATHOLIC DENTISTS.

BOSTON will soon celebrate the first three hundred years of her existence, and with her, all her neighbours who have an historical share in the Massachusetts Bay Tercentenary. The movements, civil, religious, educational and social, which have seen their beginning in this old American city in these three hundred years are many and influential. The changes she has witnessed and felt from the rugged colonial days to the present, form a familiar type of American history, but the old Puritan settlement, which finds itself to-day Catholic by majority, has lately seen a new institution "born in Boston"—a guild of Catholic dentists.

The call of the Church for Catholic lay action has been sounded anew in recent years. The lay apostolate is indeed a blessing in any community. In that spirit the Catholic dentists of Boston have built up an organization that has taken a field of its own and have carried on therein a voluntary task with a zeal and vigour that have proved far-reaching.

In 1920 a handful of these pioneers considered the idea of banding together. They were, for the most part, young men—a reminder of that young group of eight that Ozanam, when only in his twenties, gathered about him in Paris in 1833. A plan of organization was agreed upon and a letter was sent out to Catholic dentists, inviting them to attend a general meeting at which the permanent society could be formed. Over a hundred responded and in March, 1920 the guild began its promising existence. St. Apollonia, martyr, who suffered the torture of the forcible removal of her teeth, and already the patroness of dentists and their patients, was chosen as their particular patroness. A constitution and set of by-laws were adopted and, at a later date, the guild was legally incorporated under the laws of the State of Massachusetts. His Eminence, Cardinal O'Connell, accepting the office of Honorary President gave them a heartfelt blessing and full sanction and approval. Mgr. Michael J. Splaine was appointed by him as spiritual director. Thus began the Guild of St. Apollonia.

The members set before themselves their spiritual advancement, professional advancement, and practical charity as the threefold object of their guild. The free treatment of poor children was to be the principal effort of their charity. Meetings are held about once in a month and this plan has been carried out. The members are usually addressed by one of their number

or by some invited guest, who presents a paper on some phase of dentistry. The discussion that follows, the questions and answers that are aroused, indicate the keen desire of the hearers to advance in the theory and practice of their profession. A few of the titles may be mentioned to show the wide scope of subjects: "Focal Infection," "Laryngeal Tuberculosis," "Prevention of Intra-Oral Cancer," "Kidney Disease as Related to Teeth."

In its practical help to others the guild has been a mighty workman. The parochial schools of the Archdiocese of Boston number about 75,000 pupils. The authorities are using every means at their disposal to fulfil their share in protecting and developing the health of these children. Their co-operation with the health programme of the Massachusetts Department of Health, the early detection of disease, particularly tuberculosis, immunization, the conducting of a summer vacation house for needy cases, and the development of health habits, give evidence of the perfection to which health education has been carried. Rev. Richard M. Quinlan, Diocesan Supervisor, who has published these facts, states that one hundred and fifty minutes in each week of five school days are given to physical training and recess, and thirty minutes a week to the study of hygiene and physiology in those classes wherein these subjects are studied. It can be readily seen that the parochial school is not behind the public school in care of health. Nor has it failed in the dental care of its children, and it is at this point the guild steps in.

It would not be a complete story, however, were one to omit mention of the Forsyth Dental Infirmary of Boston. Built by John and Thomas Forsyth, two public-spirited, non-Catholic gentlemen, and opened in 1914, it is unique among institutions. Housed in a beautiful structure of white marble, erected and equipped at a cost of approximately a million dollars, and financially endowed, it cares for the oral health of any child up to the age of sixteen, regardless of race, creed or colour, if financially unable to obtain the service of a dentist. Not only the teeth, but the general oral and throat health of the child, are its care. A salaried intern staff and a voluntary visiting staff make up its personnel. The extent of the Forsyth service can be seen in the fact that the total number of dental operations in a year is now over one hundred thousand, with an average daily attendance of over one hundred and fifty patients. Schools, public and parochial, institutions, and individuals bring the children. A school for dental nurses, lectures by eminent medical and dental authorities, a museum, a library for dentists, and even a research laboratory are other departments of the Forsyth. It is truly a remarkable gift, and already its example has a counterpart in that of Mr. George Eastman of the Eastman Dental Infirmary, Rochester, New York.

The Catholic guild members take their places on the visiting staff. The Forsyth asks only their services, as all equipment and materials are supplied. Thus are the needy children of the parochial schools cared for. The guild has taken further steps, however, to ensure this and their system is well planned and carried out. On an assigned day, October 3, 1928, for instance, all the parochial school children are examined. The sisters are prepared to meet the dentists and the children are presented in order. The members are divided into sections and each section under the direction of its captain visits a number of schools. In one day a general oral examination is made and recorded in all the schools. Arrangements are made for the guild men to do what is needed at the Forsyth, and the schools are taken in order. Emergency cases are, of course, taken immediately. The next problem is transportation, and once again this efficient guild finds a way to solve it. An auto-bus, the gift of a benefactor, calls at the schools, and under the care of a chauffeur and matron the little patients are driven to the Forsyth and returned safe and sound. This season is the ninth in which these Catholic guild-men of the twentieth century have carried on this work. Over one hundred thousand children of the parochial schools have come under their care. No better summary can express the value of such a charity than the words of Cardinal O'Connell to the guild on this past year, in which he says, "Surely the work of the Guild has been one of continuous voluntary Christian service that is unique and unparalleled in the world of our day which is so much concerned with its own selfish interests."

In 1925 the guild pressed on to another field—a magazine for Catholic dentists. In January 1926, Vol.I., No. 1 of the *Apollonian* was published and since that date this little quarterly has regularly appeared. These Catholic dentists of Boston were brave in that attempt, but the present national circulation of about one thousand has proved their faith. The papers read at meetings are now put in permanent form and various notes of interest to the Catholic dentist can be recorded. Other subjects that are treated include such a variety as Evolution, Ethical Discussions, Medical work on the Foreign Missions, Biographies of Catholic Scientists, and Book Reviews. The Editor, Dr. Frederick A. Keyes of 416 Marlborough Street, Boston, has made use of his columns to call attention to the *Catholic Medical Guardian*, the quarterly of the Guild of SS. Luke, Cosmas and Damian, of England, and carries in each issue a half-page notice of this splendid, Catholic medical journal. Dr. Keyes has also made arrangements to take subscriptions for the *Guardian* in order to help to increase its circulation among Catholic doctors of America. Another method taken to spread the *Apollonian* is the sending of copies to the various dental schools for the

faculty and student libraries, thus reaching with its Catholic message not only the dental school authorities, but also the future Catholic dentists.

The next reasonable venture after the establishment of the *Apollonian*, was the expansion of the guild to a national membership. Were there not Catholic dentists yet unorganized in other cities? Were there not needy cases in the parochial schools in other dioceses, and other Bishops and pastors trying to solve this problem of dental health among their pupils? Again the Apollonians accomplished their plans. To-day the guild exists in a half-dozen large cities, and through local dental schools, hospitals, institutions, and in some cases in the very schools, the Catholic school children receive a care equal to anything in the public schools. The dental schools of Catholic Universities are the centres of organization in some places, but Catholic hospitals are utilized also. In yet other smaller cities a lone Apollonian can be found managing a clinic in the parish school for the pastor. Local meetings are held, of course, the *Apollonian* is the national organ, and the guild is assuming a greater and national importance.

What shall be said of their spiritual advancement, heretofore mentioned as an object of their foundation? Somewhere it is truly said that faith grows by exercise. If ever there has been that exercise and that increase of faith that bestows of its portion to the neighbour and especially to the little ones, then surely these men of the Guild of St. Apollonia have practised it. They are teaching the beauty of Catholic life and action by written and spoken word and, above all, by example. Their group Communion, their retreats at the monastery of the Passionist Fathers in Boston, their erection in St. Cecilia's church of that city of a shrine to St. Apollonia, are some of the external signs of the faith that is in their hearts. Nearly a hundred years ago the followers of St. Simon challenged the Catholics with the cry, "Show us your works!" Ozanam heard, and the St. Vincent de Paul Society was born. There is a modern rationalism that not only taunts us thus, but also claims that it alone is using the discoveries of science for the benefit of man. It asserts that it alone can care for the child. These Catholic dentists have answered. They have done more, for they are lay apostles. They have gone into the Catholic school and into the Catholic press and are a power in Catholic life. Who shall measure the hours of pain that they have relieved and prevented, or the physical disability remedied and forestalled by their service? More than all this who shall measure their reward? They can be sure of the accomplishment of their spiritual advancement, for the history of the Guild of St. Apollonia is indeed the story of men who have gone down into their own hearts and made

the fires of faith and hope and charity burn brighter there. Their Lord who preached to and healed and loved little ones will bless them.

VINCENT A. GOOKIN, S.J.

A MODERN JONAS.

IF Jonas of old was swallowed by a whale or shark (the Bible term is applicable to any large sea-animal), his would-be modern counterpart has succeeded in being swallowed by the public. At any rate his sea-yarn has gone the round of the globe and figured in print in the journals of the United States, Canada and England. It has persisted for close on forty years in spite of exposure. It has lately had a new and successful run through its reappearance in a book by Sir Francis Fox, whence it has been copied into our newspapers and our reviews. Hence it appears worth while to publish the facts of the case once more, though there is scant hope of so good a tale dying an early death. At any rate, no doubt, the readers of THE MONTH will be glad to be put on their guard against a hoary piece of fiction.

The story, with all its circumstantial details, first appeared in the *Great Yarmouth Mercury*, in the year of grace 1891. Thence it was reprinted in *Notes and Queries* for January 23, 1892, and so was fairly launched on its conquering career. Many of my readers will recall its main features. Early in the year 1891 the whaling ship, *Star of the East*, was hunting for whales not far from the Falkland Islands. That was in the days before the harpoon gun had been invented, and the work was done by hand from small boats. On the occasion in question when a whale was sighted some three miles distant on the star-board quarter two boats were manned. After the animal had been harpooned, it dragged the two boats some three miles, and then sounded or sank. On rising suddenly to the surface it began to beat the water in a furious fashion with its tail; and one of the boats which was not lucky enough to row into safety, was struck by its nose and all the men were thrown into the sea. One was drowned, and James Bartley disappeared, as his companions thought, sent to the bottom by a blow of the monster's tail.

The carcass was soon at the ship's side, and the crew worked the rest of that day and part of the night securing the blubber. Next morning they were about to haul the stomach on board when a spasmodic movement was observed within it. To the astonishment of all, this proved to be caused by the doubled-up form of their lost companion, James Bartley. He was unconscious, but cold sea-water soon brought him to himself, though not to his senses. For two weeks he remained a raving lunatic; but his recovery thereafter was rapid, and by the end of the

third week he was able to resume his duties. Only where Bartley's skin had been exposed to the action of the whale's gastric juices was it affected by his enforced imprisonment. His face and hands, however, were bleached to a deadly whiteness and had become wrinkled as if they had been parboiled. Bartley said he did not suffer from lack of air, and lost consciousness only out of terror when he realized his awful surroundings. He also found the heat oppressive. Finally the world was informed that although Bartley was by no means characterized by timidity, it was many a long week before he could enjoy sleep undisturbed by nocturnal visions of angry and threatening whales. His face and hands never recovered their natural colour, but remained yellow and wrinkled with the appearance of old parchment.

Such in brief outline is the story of James Bartley with its realistic details, that seem to have won it credence from many. But if a yarn is to be told why should it be deprived of a few touches such as could only come from an observant eye-witness or even from the principal actor in the story? But what is the truth of the matter? There was a ship named the *Star of the East*, which sailed from Auckland, N.Z., on December 27, 1890, and arrived at New York on April 17, 1891. She sailed under the British flag and was commanded by Captain Killam. This information was communicated to Canon Lukyn Williams by Lloyds in a letter dated July 26, 1906, and by him printed in the *Expository Times* for August, 1907, together with the letter to be now quoted. The Canon's next step was to get into touch with Captain Killam. He received an answer from Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, dated November 24, 1906, and written by Mrs. Killam. After excusing some delay in replying and explaining that she was writing at the request of her husband, she wrote: "There is not one word of truth in the whale story. I was with my husband all the years he was in the *Star of the East*. There was never a man lost overboard while my husband was in her. The sailor has told a great sea yarn. I wish, if it is not too much trouble to you, that you would send me one of the papers with the yarn in. . . I would like to read what is supposed to have happened on board *Star of the East* that trip." Signed, J. B. Killam. Mr. E. G. Boulenger who is Director of the Zoological Society's new aquarium, in a book published by him last year, "The Underwater World," p. 236, says that this remarkable story has been described as "moonshine" by the captain of the *Star of the East*. Whether in this he is referring to the letter quoted above, or to some other published statement I am unable to say. Spurgeon's words have been quoted in this connection before: "A lie gets half round the world before truth has got her boots on."

E. F. SUTCLIFFE.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

The Kellogg Pact.

The unanimous ratification of the Kellogg Pact on January 17th by the Government of the nation that conceived and proposed it to the rest has been rightly hailed as a distinct and momentous step in the direction of world peace—"along the only known road," as a *Times* leader puts it, "that leads away from the catastrophe which civilization so narrowly escaped." Ratifications by the other signatory nations, which include, be it remembered, Soviet Russia, will no doubt certainly and speedily follow. Given good faith, war between civilized nations is now no longer to be dreaded. Its renunciation has become an integral part of international law, so that warfare, instead of being the natural and normal means of advancing national interests, has become a crime against humanity, just as the pursuit of personal interest, or the vindication of personal rights, by violence is reckoned a crime in every civilized community. The one exception, dictated by the nature of things itself, is the right of immediate self-defence in circumstances which preclude recourse to law. Ten years ago the United States refused to join the League of Nations: now they have associated themselves with an even more comprehensive union to promote what is the primary object of the League, the abolition of war. Outside the pale of civilization, where force is the only argument and where law is unrecognized as moral obligation, armed violence may still be necessary: the frontiers of civilization will have to be guarded until they become conterminous with the world. But amongst civilized States an absolutely unqualified pledge has been exchanged never again in their mutual dealings to use the instrument of war, to regard it as unlawful, and accordingly to do away, as far as is possible and prudent, with the means of making it. We agree with the militarist in this, that so long as men and nations have the power to disregard law, force must be its ultimate sanction, but it must be force applied by international authority against an international aggressor. We may measure the importance of America's action by the depths of despair into which a rejection by the Senate would have plunged us, for that would have meant that, for a second time, the biggest nation in the world had practically denied the possibility, or cynically scorned the opportunity, of ridding the world of its greatest scourge. We have been saved that moral shock, and, with the whole civilized world for once unanimous, we may reasonably hope that increased activity will be shown in getting rid of all the obstacles to peace, such as superfluous and provocative armaments, unfair and vindictive tariffs, and especially divergence of view about "the freedom of the seas."

**Capitalism the
foe to
Universal Peace.**

In regard to armaments a thoughtful article in this issue calls attention to the parallel and peremptory need of reforming the capitalist system if they are to be reasonably reduced. One aspect of capitalism is its tendency to procure private profit by exploiting public need. Experience has shown that of all the ways to get rich quickly and enormously, supplying the demands of a great war is the best, and, if capital cannot find a profitable market under conditions of peace, it will seek other conditions. In all analyses of the causes of war, this almost automatic working of the capitalist machine is consciously or unconsciously ignored. It remains to be seen what reaction amongst these huge trade interests, which the waste of war so benefits, will be aroused by the Kellogg Pact. To quote *The Times* (Jan. 17th) once more: "the whole discussion of armaments is given a new starting point when the word 'ultimatum' is finally banished from the vocabulary of diplomacy . . . it is clear that a controversy over naval armaments cannot be intelligibly conducted in terms excluded from international consideration by the Pact itself." This is guarded language but it points to a consciousness of the futility of prolonged and acrimonious discussion of the relative proportions of armaments amongst Powers who have just signed a pledge to do away with the use of armaments altogether in international dealings. Those who have engaged themselves not to use war as an instrument of policy have implicitly precluded their use of the threat of war for similar ends. No consideration of this sort seems to have entered the heads of the Navy League which, while agreeing in its "New Year's Message" (*Times*, Dec. 31, 1928) that "the old world-order passed with the war" has no more helpful suggestion to make than that the League of Nations should "postpone its efforts for disarmament to a more propitious future"! That mentality is reflected in the United States Big Navy group which is now contending in the Senate for the construction of 15 powerful new cruisers in the next three years. We can understand the conduct of those who deprive themselves of much of their money as insurance against grave and pressing risks, but to insure heavily against risks which their own action has rendered slight and remote is so contrary to common sense that we cannot believe that the American democracy will consent to it.

**Wilson's
Second Point.**

Directly bearing upon those remote risks is the question of the freedom of the seas in war-time—the second of Wilson's famous Points which combined British and French influence rejected. International maritime law is in a state of chaos owing to variety of practice at different times, and the change of views occasioned in neutrals when they become belligerents. There is a resolution,

introduced into the American Senate nearly a year ago by Senator Borah, and still to be discussed, calling for a re-statement and re-codification of the maritime law concerning belligerents and neutrals in war-time, to be arrived at by the chief Naval Powers before the renewal of the Washington Conference in 1931. The whole future of Anglo-American relations, the real efficiency of the International Court of Justice, and indeed the fulfilment of the Kellogg Pact itself depend upon the amicable settlement of this momentous question. As we have before remarked, there is a growing sense that our true interests lie rather in the complete freedom of neutral commerce during war than in any supposed right of blockade, difficult to maintain effectively and the source of endless friction. In view of the existence of the League and the Kellogg Pact, it should not be hard to agree now to Wilson's Second Point which runs :—

Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

In other words, the right of private blockade must, in the New World created by the League and the Pact, follow the right of private war into the limbo of discarded institutions. And with the annulment of that right should go the bulk of those mighty sea-armaments which, in Great Britain, the States and Japan, are such a waste of the world's resources and such a menace to the world's peace.

**The Channel
Tunnel a means
to Peace.**

The question of the Channel Tunnel between England and France is well-calculated to test the sincerity with which these two nations have adopted the change of front in regard to war brought about by the Pact. Happily, there seems to be no trace of misgiving in France, notoriously sensitive though that country is to possibilities of invasion. In England, principally in army circles, there still lingers a manner of regarding the Tunnel which is insular in every sense. It is thought to destroy that measure of security guaranteed us by the "salt, unplumbed, estranging sea" that surrounds us. That sea remains salt, no doubt, but is now plumbed as accurately as Kensington Pond and can no longer estrange nations united by the air. The idea of its being a defensive moat seems to us as anachronistic as are moats themselves. It is the business of the soldier, no doubt, to speak to his brief, which is defence, and he is naturally loth to create new problems, but to the lay mind the possibilities of defending the Tunnel, apart altogether from destroying it, are, considering what can be done by electricity and poison-gas, innumerable. It is from the point of view of international intercourse and under-

standing that we consider the scheme desirable. The insularity of English folk is a proverb, whilst it is calculated that only one per cent. of France's population has ever set foot on our soil. Public opinion is being mobilized, both in political and commercial circles, in support of the project with such effect that the Prime Minister who refused it consideration in November last has now consented to appoint a non-party Committee to examine it in all its bearings. H.E. Cardinal Bourne has given it his support, both on general grounds and because of the advantages to Catholics here and on the Continent of closer association. Apart from the military opposition which is after all only partial, there are, of course, sectional vested interests—coastal shipping, sea-side holiday centres and the like—which look on the Tunnel with disfavour. But the balance of benefit, particularly to the cause of peace, appears to be on its side.

**Mediation
between Bolivia and
Paraguay.**

It may be considered that Bolivia and Paraguay have purged the offence against the comity of nations, which they committed by mobilizing their respective armies to contest a matter of frontiers, which had already caused bloodshed, instead of invoking the services of the League of Nations or of the Pan American Union to both of which they belong. Whereas before the war this miserable affray certainly would have dragged two nations into armed conflict, to their own great detriment and that of their neighbours, without anyone to say them nay, now the news of mobilization called forth immediate, if courteous, protest from the international bodies concerned, as well as from individual nations in some way affected like Spain and the Argentine and other S. American States, as also from the Holy See to which both nations owe allegiance in spiritual matters. From all sides the pressure of world-opinion, offering or suggesting mediation was brought to bear upon Asuncion and La Paz and it is to the credit of the Governments in both capitals that they responded immediately and without reserve to this pressure. They accepted the good offices of the Pan American Conference whilst expressing gratitude to the League Council,—which, incidentally, spent more in these its endeavours for peace than the combined Bolivian and Paraguayan contributions to the League for the year!—and early in January signed a Protocol of Conciliation establishing a tribunal of judges to investigate the actual outbreak and what followed it. The question of the ownership of the Gran Chaco, across which the disputed boundary runs, is reserved for later consideration. A *Times* leader on the subject (Jan 5th) embodies in a sentence the judgment on this question of every sensible person—"For one country that is approximately ten times the size of England and Wales and contains one-tenth of its popula-

tion to fight another that is about the same size as the British Isles, with the population of Liverpool, for the hope of an extension of territory, would indeed be strangely irrational."

**The
Pope and
Italy.**

So much smoke has been issued by the Press in regard to the settlement of the "Roman Question" that one may fairly surmise the existence of a real fire at the heart of it: in other words, it seems certain that the matter of reconciliation between Italy and the Holy See is being discussed by those concerned. A statesman like Signor Mussolini may legitimately aspire to the honour of having righted an injustice which for sixty years has embittered and hampered the relations between Church and State in the Catholic land which he rules. The Holy Father, we may presume, would welcome any solution which left unimpaired his inalienable rights to sovereign independence and to the only means by which it can be secured. Ambassadors representing sovereign States are exempt from the jurisdiction of the country to which they are accredited. The office of Ambassador of Christ surely carries with it, in its integrity, exemption from the jurisdiction of the world to which he is sent. But a visible sovereignty demands an adequate territory, as the seat and centre of its activities, and the guarantee and symbol of its independence. It was not the Popes but the founders of United Italy that created the present *impasse*: the latter should have fixed their capital elsewhere and left to the Pope the Rome that was his on indisputable titles. It is for them to find a way out of the difficulty they have created; a solution which will not dissolve the Providential connection between the Holy See and Rome. Catholics in these islands will earnestly hope and pray that this Centenary Year of their own Emancipation may see the restoration to liberty and unfettered independence of the Head of the Church.

**The Holy
Father's Golden
Jubilee.**

It would be even more apposite if this year, during which occurs the Golden Jubilee of the Holy Fathers' ordination to the priesthood, should also see the restoration of his sovereign rights. Desirous of sharing his Jubilee with his children the Pope has proclaimed 1929 an Extraordinary "Holy Year," wherein under prescribed conditions the faithful will have access to special spiritual privileges, enumerated in the Apostolic Constitution of Jan. 11th. The result will, doubtless, be a quickening of religious fervour all the world over,—it needs constant stimulation even in the best of us—and, if it please God, a great extension of the Holy Father's spiritual Kingdom. More and more the religion, centred in Rome and world-wide in its circumference, has become the only adequate witness to the truth and saving virtue of Christianity. And on the Supreme Pontiff, more than on anyone else, as the

mouthpiece of Christ's Church, has devolved the task of proclaiming the Christian message to fallen humanity. All true Catholics will pray more than ever for the welfare of their common Father during this year of Jubilee.

**An
Educational
Rally.**

We have said elsewhere that Catholics are still penalized in the matter of education. They are rated and taxed for general educational purposes and at the same time are compelled to build and maintain their own schools whilst receiving lower grants for salaries and other purposes than are given to the State schools. And all this because they hold that education means essentially religious training and that the religious training given to Catholics must itself be Catholic. At the great Birmingham Reunion meeting on Jan. 21st, Archbishop Downey of Liverpool gave eloquent utterance to the Catholic claim, showing how historically our elementary school-system came before that of the State and how the latter in its own true interests should stimulate and foster schools which have relieved the State of much expenditure and wherein clear and definite social morality is consistently taught. The Cardinal at the same meeting said that the Catholic position, acknowledged some years ago to be sound by a unanimous resolution of the House of Commons, had never been so strong as it is to-day. It cannot be logically resisted except by those blind fanatics who hold that a good Catholic cannot be a good citizen, and would, if they could, re-enact the Penal Code. We are sure to hear again, though in diminished volume, the old outcries: "Rome on the Rates," "No Tests for Teachers," "Morals without Dogma"—and it is the object of such gatherings as that on Jan. 21st, as of the meeting of the Annual Conference of the Catholic Teachers' Federation at Leeds on Jan. 3rd, to inform public opinion, both Catholic and Protestant, of the fallacies underlying those out-worn slogans.

**Higher
Education
for all.**

More than any other cause, difference of education is responsible for the undue dominance of class over class in our social structure, and it has long been the aim of reformers to afford at least the opportunity of real culture even to the lowest classes. It is because they have no common heritage in things of the mind and soul that the educated and uneducated feel constraint in each other's presence. The man with no knowledge of history or literature or philosophy or economics, or even of science except in its practical aspects, finds a very small conversational meeting-ground with another more liberally-educated. We need not wonder, then, that the representatives of Labour are determined to remedy this inequality and that they will be inclined to support the Hadow scheme, the essence of which is to remove the child

from the ordinary elementary school at the age of eleven, and send him or her to a central school to receive higher education. Catholics who know the need and the value of true education will approve of this ideal, but they must needs question its feasibility in present circumstances and its compatibility with their own irreducible claims. Better, it would seem, improve elementary education and raise the school age by a year or two, than embark on a very costly enterprise, which may provide the child of eleven with a better secular culture but will remove him from religious influences at the most critical time of life. We must, while opposing such consequences, take care to show that better education for "elementary" children has our warm support.

**State
Scholarships for
Poor Children.**

It is a significant fact that the bold proposal made by Cardinal Bourne at the Manchester Congress three years ago, that parents who needed such aid should be provided by the State with educational scholarships for their children, and allowed the same freedom of choice in expending them as the well-to-do enjoy, has been revived in another form by the Secretary of the Teachers' Registration Council in an address, reported in *The Times* for Jan. 3rd, and headed "A Revolutionary Proposal." It is an endeavour to get back to the conception that education is primarily the business and responsibility of the parents, to help whom, according to Mr. Roscoe, the State should, when necessary, issue "educational warrants," covering the cost of schooling, leaving to the parents the free selection of a school. We cannot comment on the details of this proposal: what is significant in it is the abandonment of the Socialist notion that the State has the chief and predominant interest in the education of the child. Catholics have always upheld parental rights and duties in this matter whatever the creed of the parent, and deplored the tendency, in which even Conservatives acquiesce, on the part of the State to usurp them.

**No
Morality without
Dogma.**

The educational conferences at the end of the year were much exercised by the question of religious teaching in schools and the reading of the Bible. We were presented with the usual spectacle of educated men pleading for religious instruction, without acknowledging that it has no solid basis save in the dogmatism of the Catholic Church, and lamenting the decline of Bible reading, without condemning those who deny the inspiration of the Bible. Once again the revolt of the XVI. Century has proved bankrupt in promise. Abandoning religious authority in the name of spiritual liberty it produced religious chaos: withdrawing the Scriptures from the guardianship of the Church in the name of private judgment it has gone far to destroy the reverence and

obedience due to them as the oracles of God. The descendants of the reformers are now vainly looking for a foundation for the moral teaching, which they see is needed to preserve society, and for grounds other than human reason on which they may recommend their Scripture interpretations. Hence, the deplorable state of religious knowledge in non-Catholic secondary schools and the ignorance of Christianity amongst those whom the State has deprived of adequate religious instruction in its elementary system. All we can hope is that the recognition of the malady may be followed by some attempts to remedy it.

**Anglican
Notions of the
Church.**

Writing as we are during the course of the Octave of Prayers for the Unity of Christendom, *i.e.*, the gathering into the one Fold of the True Church of those scattered flocks that profess, more or less completely, allegiance to Christ, we are necessarily struck by the very divergent ideas of the nature and functions of the Church which He instituted among those who do not belong to it. Here, for instance, is an expression of opinion from an important Anglican Prelate, the Bishop of Liverpool, who admitted during a recent Students' Conference all denominations there assembled to the Anglican communion-service and justified his action by saying :—

I should like to go a step further [than the interchange of pulpits] and see an interchange of worship. I can see no harm, and I can see much good, in a man belonging, as it were, to two or more Churches at the same time.

No one could utter these extraordinary words unless he thought that no existing Church was the Church which Christ founded : that all alike were unable to teach with certainty : that the Holy Spirit's function of conveying to men all truth was unfulfilled : that the Incarnation, in a word had failed of its purpose. Yet the speaker calls himself a Christian Bishop.

**Recognition
of non-Episcopal
Bodies.**

Again the absurdity of trying to convert the heathen to Anglicanism, which meant asking the Hindoo or the Chinaman to join the Church founded by Elizabeth, has led to the formation of "autonomous" Anglican Churches in different parts of the world—India, China, Japan, Australia—so that they can be severally described as "national" in those lands. But did Our Lord, who spoke so emphatically of "one Fold and one Shepherd" (John x. 16) mean to found "national churches"? What has nationality to do with the Christian religion, the aim of which was to break down all racial barriers and unite men in one brotherhood? Does a series of independent federated bodies, widely divergent in belief and practice, correspond in any way to the Church described by

its Founder in the Gospels? No unbiased mind can think so, yet even Anglican ideals seem to reach no higher. The *Church Times* is constantly warning its readers that an organized attempt will be made at the Lambeth Congress next year to admit non-episcopal bodies to full communion with Anglicanism; already the Church in South India is debating the inclusion of Nonconformist bodies within its boundaries; and on Jan. 20th was held at Geneva the first inter-religious service, as arranged by the Stockholm and Lausanne Church Conferences. In this "Culte Inter-confessional," we are told, "representatives of the Old Catholic, Lutheran, Anglican and Protestant Churches took part." There was, of course, no reason why they shouldn't, being all sects founded on private judgment, but what a conception of the Church does such inter-communion imply! With pathetic blindness to the actual condition of its communion, the *Church Times* (Jan. 11th) asserts that "it [our Church] must remain a recognizable Church having a definite mind of its own." Note the false implication in the word "remain" and the heresy involved in the term "a recognizable Church"! Once more we ask,—is there more than one Church of Christ?

The
Erastian
View.

An Anglican ecclesiastical lawyer, Sir Lewis Dibdin, Dean of the Court of Arches, holds yet another view of the Church of England, which he set forth in two articles in *The Times* on

Jan. 7th and 8th. As befits his office as a lay judge of ecclesiastical causes, he is thoroughly Erastian in his estimate of the Church's character, holding with Maitland that the essential difference between the new religion and the old lay in the matter of jurisdiction, or, as we should say, Apostolicity. Henry asserted and Elizabeth took over from her father what the Dean calls "supremacy of rule": he might have quoted, in support of this view, Lord Campbell's declaration in the Gorham Judgment (1850) that the effect of the legislation which finally established Elizabeth's State-Church was to transfer to the Crown the entire jurisdiction which before the Reformation had been exercised by the Pope. It was an action just as legally valid as if Nero in earlier times had usurped St. Peter's jurisdiction over the infant Catholic Church. With truly Tudor insolence Henry had contended that it was St. Peter's successor who was the usurper and that he, Henry, was merely resuming the ancient God-given rights of the English Crown. The jurisdiction, as well as the orders, of Elizabeth's new hierarchy were derived from the Crown: there was no other source: to talk of the "spiritual independence" of a body so constituted is, as Dean Inge aptly says "all fustian." Sir Lewis shares Henry's view and speaks of "those who rescued England from the tyranny of Rome and established and restored the Church of England on a reasonable as well as a primitive

basis." He does not seem to realize that there was no Church of England in the national sense before Elizabeth's creation: there was in England a part of the Catholic Church as completely under the spiritual control of the Pope as were those portions of the same entity in France, Italy and Spain. The Church in England was Roman from the first, since even the Celtic Church, both the British and the Scots-Irish, acknowledged the supremacy of the Holy See. Even lawyers have to be on their guard against reading history through the spectacles of prejudice.

Dr. Hensley
Henson's wrong
views.

The Bishop of Durham, champion now-a-days of the "spiritual independence" of Anglicanism, although once he was as stout an Erastian as Sir Lewis, answered the letter in *The Times* of Jan. 11th. He owns that the change under Henry meant that "the Divine Right of the Christian King was advanced against the Divine Right of the Roman Pontiff"—the familiar struggle between Cæsar and Peter, for the conscience and soul of man. But he begs the whole question when he goes on to say that "the struggle between the rivals proceeded within the Christian Church." Cæsar by his rebellion put himself outside the Fold: the Church does not tolerate schism or heresy. We need not follow the argument between the Bishop and the Dean: both are radically wrong in their reading of history, but the latter is the better judge of actual facts. *De facto* Anglicanism is not spiritually independent. Many of its prelates and multitudes of its members rejoice in being subordinate to the State. An Anglican clergyman, Dr. Bethune Baker, thanks his God that there is State authority to keep the Bishops in their proper place. If there is to be any disestablishment, let an occasional rebellious Bishop be disestablished, but leave the Anglican Church in her historic position as a State department. "You can't have it both ways," says equivalently the veteran Bishop Knox (*Times*, Jan. 23rd). "You claim to have received jurisdiction from Christ and His Holy Spirit. Be it so. Your course is perfectly clear. You must put an end to the pretension that you are a State Church, in which the State claims to interpret the law of public worship and entrusts to you as her officers the duty of enforcing that law." And he goes on to say in regard to the Bishops that "that which jars on the public conscience is their readiness to enjoy all the pecuniary and other benefits of a law-established Church together with Lord Hugh Cecil's contempt of law 'as nude law' when it contravenes their doctrinal or other prepossessions." These are the words of the genuine Elizabethan and they find a ready echo in Evangelical and Modernist circles. We cannot but sympathize with those, who like Bishop Hensley Henson have discovered that State "supremacy of rule" is fatal to the claims of Anglicanism to be a Church, and are all for demanding disestablishment, at whatever sacrifice of possessions

or position, in order to vindicate their spiritual independence. They are, unhappily, several hundred years too late. Their ecclesiastical status, such as it is, is derived from that "Christian Prince," Henry VIII., or more correctly, from his illegitimate daughter. *Qualis ab incepto.*

**Anglicanism
essentially
Erastian.**

It is interesting in this connection to recall the campaign waged by *The Times* and several of the Anglican Bishops in 1919 against the Enabling Bill, that modest measure of freedom granted to the Anglican Church by its State master. Their fear was that, in spite of the final authority reserved to the State, the Church Assembly "would almost certainly be pressed to adopt measures which would tend to narrow the basis of the Church of England and by giving it a denominational rather than a national character deprive two-thirds of the citizens of the country of rights which are secured to them by the present conditions of the Establishment" (*Times*, June 18, 1919). And the late Lord Haldane actually moved an amendment expressing the unwillingness of the House "to assent to legislation which would exclude the greater part of the people of England from effective influence in the affairs of the National Church as established by the Constitution." Of the opposing prelates the most prominent were Bishop Diggle of Carlisle, Bishop Knox of Manchester, and—Bishop Hensley Henson of Hereford! Bishop Diggle is dead, Bishop Knox in retirement still runs true to form, but what the last-named then supported he has come to regard as an intolerable arrangement. The Enabling Act which he dreaded has proved to his present chagrin inoperative. In his December diocesan charge he writes: "The rejection of the Prayer Book Measure has demonstrated that such self-government as was conferred on the Church of England by the Enabling Act is fictional and that in reality the Church of England is subject to the control of Parliament even in spiritual concerns." But the Catholic Church in England, whether before or after the Reformation, in spite of former state-encroachments and later persecution was never so subject. The Bishop is wholly right in his present diagnosis: he has only to realize that what makes Parliamentary domination inconsistent with the character of the Christian Church is not the mixed beliefs of Members of Parliament but the fact that they are layfolk, in order to assimilate the entire Catholic view.

Mgr. Batiffol.

It is sad that the death of Mgr. Duchesne should have been followed at a comparatively short interval by that of his former pupil, Mgr. Pierre Henri Batiffol. Both these scholars represent a type which in their concentration upon points of vital importance such as the primitive constitution of the Church, and in the width

of outlook which kept them in touch with what was being written by honest investigation of other creeds, we can ill afford to lose. Ever since the appearance in 1893 of his "*Histoire du Bréviaire*" Mgr. Batiffol has been recognized as one of the foremost and most independent-minded of those students who have interested themselves in early liturgy and Christian origins. The relations of Anglicanism and the teaching of the patristic period always had a special attraction for him and if on the one hand he favoured the Malines Conversations and was more hopeful than most English Catholics could be of the good that might result, he nevertheless expressed himself very clearly in his little book "*Catholicisme et Papauté—Les Difficultés anglicanes et russes*" (1925). There was no sort of minimizing of the obstacles which had to be overcome before anything like reunion could be attained. Happily Mgr. Batiffol was a writer whose criticism was free from acrimony, and he was almost as much respected by those from whom he differed as among his own co-religionists. The high position which he held among original investigators of primitive Christian history received public recognition in England when in 1921 the University of Oxford conferred upon him the degree of Hon. D.Litt. It was part of the open-mindedness of this distinguished scholar that when he saw reason he did not hesitate to retract opinions which he had previously expressed. A good many corrections of minor points of detail were introduced into the third edition of the *History of the Breviary*, of which an English translation appeared in 1912, but perhaps even a more striking example of his change of outlook is presented by his chapter on the "Agape" in the 6th edition of his "*Etudes d'Histoire et de Théologie positive*." More than one of Mgr. Batiffol's more important contributions to literature have been translated into English, notably those called "*Primitive Catholicism*," and "*The Credibility of the Gospel*" ("*'Orpheus' et l'Evangile*"), the last a criticism of Theodore Reinach's notorious indiscretion.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Eucharist, The, Source of Spiritual Vigour [Dom G. Laporta in *Ecclesiastical Review*, Jan. 1929, p. 1].

Spiritualism Satanic [F. Woodlock, S.J., in *Catholic Times*, Jan. 18, 1929, p. 11].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Lay Apostolate: Meaning and Practice [Dr. J. J. Harbrecht in *Ecclesiastical Review*, Jan. 1929, p. 13].

Islam, The Menace of [P. S. Paulit in *Catholic Times*, Jan. 18, 1929, p. 14].

Politics detrimental to Religion in France [Abbé A. Lugan in *Dublin Review*, Jan. 1929, p. 95].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Art and its meaning [E. Lester in *Tablet*, Jan. 19, 1929, p. 83].

Bolivia and Paraguay: cause and history of dispute [H. D. Irvine in *Tablet*, Jan. 19, 1929, p. 75].

Burke and Emancipation [D. Gwynn in *Catholic World*, Jan. 1929, p. 385].

Social Service, The C.W.L. Conference on [S. Cunningham in the *Catholic Woman's Outlook*, Jan. 1929, p. 27].

Greek Schism, Papal Efforts to end [Gertrude Robinson in *Dublin Review*, Jan. 1929, p. 1].

Holy Year, Privileges of the New [*Tablet*, Jan. 19, 1929, p. 85].

Pope, Sacerdotal Jubilee of the [*Civiltà Cattolica*, Dec. 15, 1928, p. 481].

Unity Octave: its one object [*Tablet*, Jan. 19, 1929, p. 23].

Wife: The Perfect Catholic [*Stella Maris*, Jan. 1929, p. 14].

REVIEWS

I—THE EARLY PAPACY—EAST AND WEST¹

CATHOLIC and non-Catholic readers alike will find much useful and entertaining matter in the volume which Dom John Chapman has made up of papers written for Catholic reviews within the last thirty years, together with a lecture delivered before the Society of St. John Chrysostom last February. All the papers were well worth preserving, and we strongly recommend this work to all who are interested in Catholic apologetics and to those who may find themselves in painful uncertainty regarding the ultimate seat of spiritual authority in the Church. This question is as living to-day as it has ever been. The Protestant world is keenly alive to it, and the Orthodox East has had its attention directed to the same problem—the problem of Christian Unity—by the political calamities of modern times and by the various movements in favour of Christian reunion by which they have been, to a certain extent, affected. It was an Eastern theologian who remarked recently that the objection of his fellow-countrymen was not to the historical Papacy, but to the Papacy *dogmatized*. Let the Latin Church join with the Greek on terms of equality and the position of the Holy See as the centre of Christendom, *jure ecclesiastico*, would be recognized far more cordially than at any former period in its history. The suggestion is, of course, impracticable but it marks the new orientation of theological opinion outside of the Church. As Dom Chapman says, "At the present day few scholars are very anti-Papal." There is a general recognition that Rome is the only conceivable centre of a reunited Christendom. This is a great point gained.

The present volume will enable enquirers, who have reached some such position as this, to see what precisely the Roman primacy meant in the golden age of the Fathers. Here, we could have no more competent guide than Father Chapman. In him one finds broad and accurate scholarship combined with clearness of narrative and a lightness of touch that make the study of historical problems a real pleasure. We think, too, that even a less friendly reader than the present reviewer would be compelled to pay tribute to the writer's moderation and candour. In short, we have here a volume of controversy of very exceptional merit.

¹ *Studies on the Early Papacy*. By Dom John Chapman. London: Sheed and Ward. Pp. 238. Price, 7s. 6d. net.

The subjects treated are: the Growth of the Patriarchates, St. Cyprian on the Church, St. Athanasius and Pope Julius I., St. Chrysostom and St. Peter, St. Jerome and Rome, the Condemnation of Pelagianism, Apiarius, the Age of Justinian. The three last-named are of peculiar interest, because they show us ecclesiastical obedience under very special difficulties. Both in the Pelagian troubles and in the affair of Apiarius, Africa had a grievance against Rome, and the grievance was set forth in language quite sufficiently explicit. There was no suggestion, however, that Papal interference was in itself an intrusion; as there infallibly would have been, if the Pope's right had not been accepted as common ground by all parties. It is precisely in times of tension and misunderstanding that the principle of obedience is tested. The case of Vigilius in the time of Justinian is perhaps still more striking. Here was a Pope who had shown great personal weakness, and who was absolutely without earthly backing of any kind: a Pope, in Father Chapman's words, "who has been insulted by the civil power, is in sanctuary [at Constantinople] for safety, has personally no good character, is not obviously in the right, and has already twice contradicted himself." And yet it was before such a Pope, at such a moment, that the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Metropolitans of other great Eastern sees had to "lick the very dust" by accepting a document "more searching and humiliating than the formula of Hormisdas." Surely no clearer evidence could be desired of the nature and extent of the Primacy recognized by these Easterns in the occupant of the Apostolic See.

Dom Chapman's work on St. Cyprian is well known to scholars. The essay on that Father (number two in this volume) was published in the *Revue Benedictine* for October, 1910. It is an excellent antidote to the familiar Anglican presentation.

2—PHILOSOPHICAL THEOLOGY¹

THIS volume reaches to four hundred and twenty-eight pages and is to be succeeded by another. This second, when it appears, will deal expressly with Theism. There is very little about God in the present volume. It prepares the way and is an attempt at a philosophic system in the terms of which our knowledge of God can be determined. For a decisive judgment, therefore, of the success of this work we must wait for the

¹ By F. R. Tennant. Vol. I. Cambridge at the University Press. Pp. 428. Price, 21s.

second volume. It is possible, however, already to forecast the result. The conclusions reached by Dr. Tennant seem to exclude the use of the cosmological argument for the existence of God. As he definitely rejects the modern argument from religious experience it will be interesting to see what line of proof will be followed.

The book is packed with learning, and a glance at the table of contents might lead the reader to hope that this large work might prove the most complete and up-to-date statement of Theism. I fear the reader would be deceived. Dr. Tennant has much that is excellent to say. His criticisms of many modern philosophic tenets are forcible and informed; he crushes enemies by sheer weight of knowledge, but there is a gap in his own defences. He is, as he acknowledges, a disciple of the late James Ward and, consequently, we find a strong bias in favour of psychology and of the psychological methods of that professor. Now English philosophy owes much to Ward, but many, and I think quite rightly, hold that his attempt to construct the nature of knowing and willing out of primitive data has proved and must prove a failure. To put this error in short form, Dr. Tennant would improve Epistemology by psychology. He believes that the latter is primary. This initial mistake is responsible for a series of views, many of which are precarious and some definitely wrong. He is placed too in the most uncomfortable position of a solipsist who believes in an external world. He does not himself realize how desperate that situation is, for Dr. Tennant does not suffer from nerves or want of assurance.

For this reason alone then I do not think Dr. Tennant can be regarded as the Perseus who will rescue religion from the jaws of modern science or philosophy. He has neglected aid which would have made him much less vulnerable and shown him that Theism is in no danger. There are other faults, too, which detract from the value of his work. One must be mentioned. The thought is clear, but the language of the book is of a kind to madden all but the most patient. Ugly words are invented without necessity, and the long word is almost invariably preferred to the short. One example chosen at random will serve. "If dreams subsist at all through their reproductive imagery being for the time beyond correction by appeal to the impressional, our waking life in the conceptual world of common sense and science may be another sort of dream, subsisting only in virtue of the constructions of our creative and interpretative imagination being uncorrected by appeal to the ontal hidden from the mind's eye." This kind of sentence makes one despair of philosophers, or should I say theologians?

M. D'ARCY.

3—THE PEDIGREE OF FASCISM¹

MISS ALINE LION, of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, has given us in this work an historical and philosophical analysis of the conditions which led up to the Fascist movement and the political ideas which it embodies. Many years of residence in Italy, both before and after the war, enable her to speak with authority on the political and social conditions prior to the advent of Mussolini. She is not herself a Fascist, nor an apostle of Fascism, but is convinced that Fascism has done great things for Italy. The present work is an attempt to estimate in abstract terms the precise import of these services. For this purpose, she finds it necessary to go back to the Renaissance, to Vico, to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Over a hundred pages are devoted to these topics, and it is not until page 170 that we arrive at Benedetto Croce, and within measurable distance of Benito Mussolini.

It seems, at first sight, a needlessly elaborate method of approach, and some readers, no doubt, will find the volume over-academic. After all, it is as a doer rather than a thinker that Mussolini will have left his mark on the age. And yet, we feel sure there is a large justification for the more speculative method of treatment which Miss Lion has adopted. Theory counts far more with the Latin than with the English mind in statecraft. Whether he be Liberal or Catholic, Socialist or Individualist, the man of the South will want to have a complete and consistent theory to justify his attitude. It is not so in England; at least, it has not been so in the past. Tradition and authority have always weighed more in our party-politics than scientific doctrines. Rarely have our statesmen preferred to go by theory, and inconsistency has never been a capital offence. It is, therefore, perhaps all the more wholesome for us to approach a political study, for once in a way, from a speculative rather than a purely practical standpoint.

We are sorry that Miss Lion has made the reading of her exposition (described on the title-page as a popular one) somewhat unnecessarily difficult by the constant employment of the terminology and concepts of German Idealism. Not that she is herself an Hegelian. But she has been "briefed" in questions of history and philosophy by the German, Windelband. We think she has failed to allow for the bias in the writer. What she has to say could really have been put quite as well, or better, and more intelligibly for the general public, in terms of philosophical Realism. The chapter on Gentile is interesting, especially as an exposé of his views on education: but here Miss Lion

¹ By Aline Lion. London; Sheed and Ward. Pp. 234. Price 10s. 6d.

would appear to be exaggerating when she claims for this philosopher "a deep and almost unerring sense of Christianity." The authoress herself is a Catholic, but does not seem to have much acquaintance with Catholic philosophy.

4—A GREAT ARCHBISHOP¹

THIS book is another proof that good biography is the best form of history. When events are grouped around a personality they "come alive," as they do not when grouped around dates or theories. Archbishop Walsh played a prominent and decisive part in some of the chief political controversies of his day, and this sober, temperate narrative of his activities throws new and welcome light on the tangle of events. The Archbishop was a great man if greatness is to be measured by character. He was called upon to suffer very much on account of his love for Ireland. He had enough that was evil and untrue said or insinuated about him to try the patience of a saint, but he never dreamt of taking reprisals. Indeed, he was well-nigh heroic in patience and forbearance. His attitude after the condemnation of the "Plan of Campaign" resembled Fénelon's on a parallel occasion. The two great loyalties of his life were to the Holy See and his native land. Owing to the activities of a small group of English Catholics whose sentiments were voiced by the *Tablet* of those days, it was no easy thing to preserve the two loyalties intact, but Archbishop Walsh's faith and charity were equal to the task. Happily, as an offset to the intrigues here in question, Walsh had a powerful ally in Cardinal Manning. In the correspondence between the two, Manning rises to his full stature. English of the English, he showed himself a magnanimous, generous friend of Ireland's legitimate aspirations. The letters in this volume are almost enough of themselves to blow into the dustbin such cobwebs as Mr. Strachey and his kind have woven about the Cardinal.

Besides the matters of political interest in the book, we are given many welcome details about the Church in Ireland, and about the private life of the Archbishop. He was assuredly of the race of the great ecclesiastics, and it is good to know that his biographer intends to publish another volume dealing more in detail with his spiritual life and pastoral activities. Only once in a while does such a really big man appear, and he deserves a big tribute.

A few regrets come to us when reading the present book. The chief is that we may never hope for a worthy biography of that

¹ *William J. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin.* By the Rt. Rev. P. J. Walsh, M.A. London: Longmans. Pp. xvi. 612. Price, 21s. net.

most attractive and individual of prelates, Archbishop Croke. The odd fragments of his letters which are given by Mgr. Walsh whet the appetite for much more of such racy, humorous wisdom. Croke was a man in a million. Another regret we cannot help feeling is that Mgr. Walsh should not have given the full history of the University question which led to the Archbishop's resignation, and indeed should have confined himself so very strictly to the exits and entrances of his hero. He credits his readers with too much information on such matters as the "Plan of Campaign," the Parnell crisis, etc. In one place he tells how Walsh solved a very difficult cipher, much to the benefit of Parnell and the Irish cause. The Archbishop spent a whole night over the puzzle, and it would have been decidedly interesting in this era of crosswords to know how he unravelled it. His biographer keeps the secret to himself. The material production of the book, no doubt to keep down the cost, is not quite worthy of the subject. On p. 392 there is an asterisk without any corresponding footnote or reference. An extract from a letter of Mr. Serjeant Sullivan is given on p. 377 which might just as well not be there. If it was thought worth while to refer to this letter, the reader should have been informed what it was about and why the Archbishop did not answer it. These are small blemishes, but they are representative of other similar ones, which show all the more because the biography on the whole is such a careful, restrained and admirably written piece of work. We are glad to note that some inaccuracies in Sir James O'Connor's so-called *History of Ireland* are faithfully dealt with in an Appendix.

J.B.

SHORT NOTICES.

BIBLICAL.

A VOLUME which should do much to facilitate study of the Scriptures is Fr. Newton Thompson's **Verbal Concordance to the New Testament: Rheims Version** (B.O. & W.: 15s.). It is a large quarto book in double columns, excellently printed and got up, and practically exhaustive, representing an enormous amount of labour on the part of the learned compiler, and a corresponding saving of labour for the busy preacher. It would have helped to have been told which of the several revisions of the Rheims N.T. was used: presumably that now commonly printed. We commend this valuable volume to all our readers.

Several literary men—Messrs. A. Nairne, T. R. Glover and Sir A. Quiller-Couch—have joined in producing **The Cambridge Shorter Bible** (University Press: 7s. 6d. n.), intended for use in the higher forms of Protestant schools. The principle and method of arrangement cannot, of course, meet with Catholic approval: it is not in the province of

ordinary lay-folk to select at their discretion what part of the Word of God shall be read and studied, leaving out "the least attractive parts." But with the notion that the whole Bible, at least all the Old Testament, should not be put into the hands of the young and immature, Catholic practice is in full accord and we are glad to see it carried out in this cheap and well-produced book.

HISTORICAL.

If anyone thinks that, in taking up **The Poor Clares in Ireland** (A.D. 1629—A.D. 1929), by Mrs. Thomas Concannon (Gill and Son: 6s.), he is going to read just an edifying account of good Religious, he will find himself agreeably surprised and mistaken. We have here just one of those histories, of which we cannot have too many, linking up our own generation with that of our Elizabethan martyrs, and proving beyond any doubt where true continuity lies; the continuity of blood in a double sense. Beginning, like so many of their Sisters, in the Low Countries, bravely risking everything to return to Ireland when there seemed a glimmer of a hope, driven away and finding a home for the most part in Spain, once more back in Ireland after the Restoration,—the story is one of bravery and tenacity for the cause of Christ worthy of the Church's best traditions. Mrs. Concannon has spared no pains in her research, and she has the historian's true instinct for interpretation. Her book teems with names which will be dear to many in Ireland and England, who will see from her work something more that their ancestors have done and suffered that we may inherit the Faith.

In **The American Foundations of the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur** (The Dolphin Press: Philadelphia: \$5.00) we have an interesting contribution to the history of Catholic Education in the United States. Annals of a religious Institute written expressly with the object of handing on to a younger generation a record of the labours and trials of their predecessors are naturally somewhat limited in their appeal. But the work of the Sisters of Notre Dame is so well known, and its influence so far-reaching, that this book will probably find a wide circle of readers. With a wealth of intimate detail it tells of the spread of the Institute in America from the arrival of the first little band of Sisters at Cincinnati in 1840 till the present day, when the three "provinces" of Cincinnati, California, and Waltham include no fewer than seventy houses with one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one Religious. The educational activities of the Sisters of Notre Dame in Great Britain are so familiar to many that we need not enlarge upon them here, but it is interesting to note that whilst their foundations in this country number only nineteen, the number of Religious is more than eight hundred. The relative differences are due to several causes, the chief of which is, perhaps, that whilst Catholic schools and colleges on this side are State-aided, in America they are strictly *voluntary*. Parish schools, whether urban or rural, depend on the support of the faithful. The conditions of service being less remunerative than in State schools, these voluntary schools are generally staffed by members of Religious Orders, hence the number of small communities of Sisters of Notre Dame in America. How many of these seedlings have grown

into strong flourishing trees is here described with sympathy and thanksgiving from the witness of many who have shared with their pioneer Sisters the heat and burden of days that are past. These simple annals disarm criticism: they have an artlessness all their own; they reveal the unselfconscious heroism of those who instruct many unto justice; they prove, if proof be needed, that the *unum necessarium* is the compass of all who seek to serve God in the so-called *active* life; above all, they illustrate in numberless ways that threefold spirit of charity, simplicity, and obedience which is the hall-mark of every true daughter of Blessed Julie Billiart. The publishers have done their work well; both printing and illustrations are good.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

It is a strange thing that only until very recent years has the world in general come to know much of the foundress of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith. It is perhaps stranger still that when we do come to know her, she is found to be one of the most interesting characters of whom one has ever read. But it is not strange to discover that one whose sympathies were so astonishingly universal should herself have been a very human being indeed. Such are one's first reflections after reading **Pauline Jaricot**, Foundress of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith (1799—1862), translated from the French of Elizabeth Sainte-Marie Perrin (Burns, Oates and Washbourne: 7s. 6d.). The authoress, a relation of her heroine, has had access to many documents, and evidently to many family memories and traditions, which she has used to make her work peculiarly living. Pauline Jaricot was not only the foundress of the great organization we now know. She had a genius for charity; there seemed to be nothing and no one whom she did not help. And she died ignored, and was soon forgotten, except in the hearts of a few. One compares her to St. Francis Xavier, in life and in death. This is a Life we can heartily recommend to all.

The story of the spread of the Redemptorists over Europe during the first years of last century is proof sufficient of their call by God to be the antidote to the age of Revolution, even as the Jesuits were of the Reformation. This story we have best told in the lives of those who carried out the work, above all that of St. Clement Hofbauer. To these we may add **The Life of the Venerable Joseph Passerat**, by Henri Giroville, C.S.S.R., translated by Father James Carr, C.S.S.R. (Sands and Co.: 12s. 6d.) This truly apostolic man, the close companion and successor to St. Clement Hofbauer, is probably the founder of more houses of Redemptorists and Redemptoristines than any other member of the Congregation of St. Alphonsus; they are stretched like a chain across Europe, and he had much to do with first settlements in America. Still, all his labour and travels were not to him, and are not to his brethren to-day, the chief matter of importance in his life. He stands out as a model Redemptorist, in his spirit of prayer, in his utter devotion to the rule, in his insistence on the interior life, in a habit of continued recollection which was the envy of St. Clement himself. The translation is excellently done.

Every student of English Church History will be grateful to the

Very Rev. Father Philip Hallett, Rector of St. John's Seminary, Womersley, for his admirable translation of **The Life and Illustrious Martyrdom of Sir Thomas More**, written by Thomas Stapleton before 1588 (B.O. & W.: 6s.). Stapleton was himself one of the great men of his time whom, as the late Professor Phillimore pointed out more than once, the English Reformation drove from this country; as such, he was a lineal descendant of the scholarship virtually founded by More and Colet. Moreover he had a great man's admiration of greatness, and he was quick to see it illustrated in More, both in his life and in his death. Hence there is in this Life a true devotion, manifested by one of the generation immediately following that of the martyr, which a modern writer cannot express. For a knowledge of More, Stapleton's Life has always been the main source; it is therefore important that it should be easily accessible. Father Hallett has done all a great service; with Stapleton's Life and the Life by Father Bridgett a lover of Blessed Thomas More will need little else.

The life of Father Pro, S.J., the Mexican martyr of 1927, has at last been written completely in **Pour le Christ-Roi** by Father Antonio Dragon, S.J. (Messenger Press, Montreal). As we expected, there is more to be said about this real hero than to tell the story of his death: there was something heroic about him from the beginning. It is an inspiring life from first to last. The illustrations will interest many, especially those of Father Pro's disguises.

Students of Catholic Emancipation in Ireland will find abundant material to give them joy in **The Life of Margaret Aylward**, Foundress of the Sisters of the Holy Faith, by Margaret Gibbons (Sands and Co.: 16s.). Like Mary Ward in the worst days of the English persecution, Margaret tried her vocation first in one Order and then in another, thus being trained by God to found her own, more specially suited for the time in which she lived. Margaret Aylward may be looked upon as the champion and saviour of the Irish poor in the evil days when Protestant venal proselytism was rampant. For their sakes she went to prison, for them she opened institutions all over the country, for them she founded, almost unconsciously, her Sisters of the Holy Faith. But there are many other things in the book; in it we meet many of the most remarkable characters in Ireland from O'Connell to John Steiner, with many of the events connected with their lives. And behind all is the strong, fervent, devoted, self-effacing, generous character of Margaret herself, one more of those wonderful women whom Ireland has produced in the last hundred years. It is an admirable biography, excellently written and produced.

MORAL.

The authoress of *My Pretty Maid*—reflections on the modern tendencies of girlhood—has put together much salutary advice on **Love, Courtship and Marriage** (Sands: 1s. n.), by way of buoying more effectively that much-travelled channel to a much-desired haven. Very prudent is the advice and well-confirmed by ancient and modern instances, and its somewhat disjointed character makes it the easier to assimilate.

REFERENCE BOOKS.

Our weekly papers have already selected the "plums" from the 1929 **Catholic Directory** (B.O. and W.: 3s. 6d.)—records of conversions, increase in numbers of churches, etc., so we need not dwell on what is of only temporary interest. The permanent value of the book, which should ensure a copy being found in every Catholic family, is the information about the present state of the Church in this country, and the facilities afforded everywhere for attendance at religious services, facilities for education, etc. The first *Catholic Directory* was published in 1837: we wish it were possible to compile an ecclesiastical map of that year, as well as of the present. But the present map is still blank enough to excite the zeal of those who wish their country as well as themselves emancipated.

The **Catholic Who's Who for 1929** (B.O. and W.: 5s. n.) has happily secured a preface by the Cardinal Archbishop, who in his introductory sentence expresses a similar wish to that just penned. His Eminence would welcome the opportunity of seeing a *Catholic Who's Who* for 1829 or the years immediately following. In default of that, he makes a most interesting comparison with what our early *Catholic Directories* tell us about the then condition of Catholic affairs and the present,—a survey which gives distinction and importance to this issue of a well-known and indispensable book.

Just when the *Jesuit Directory for the English Province*, having apparently exhausted its market, has ceased publication, there is issued a similar venture across the Channel—**The Irish Jesuit Directory and Year Book** (Irish Messenger Office, Dublin: 1s.), which contains a great variety of interesting matter besides the statistics of the work and activities at home and abroad of the Irish Province. We wish it a wide and useful career.

The general subject treated of in the **Catholic Social Year Book for 1928** (C.S.G., Oxford: 1s. n.) which appeared late last year, is *Retreats*, a subject of primary importance in social reform. A purely material view of life and its problems gives no help to their solution: it is only when we have become rightly "oriented" by viewing this world in the light of the next that we can judge aright of schemes for human betterment. The matter is very thoroughly dealt with in this booklet, which discusses in seven chapters every aspect historical and practical of the retreat-movement.

POETRY.

The verse in **The Pilgrim and other Poems** (Longmans: 2s. 6d. n.), by an anonymous author has an appreciative foreword by an Anglican Bishop, so we assume the writer belongs to that Body. But that is the only positive indication, for the substance of these poems is wholly Catholic in their devotion to Christ and His Mother, their praise of Christian virtue and their general unworldliness. The non-Catholic, however, is hinted at by omissions: nothing here in homage of the central mystery of Catholicism, the Holy Eucharist; no eulogy of the Church, the Spotless Bride of Christ; no filial love expressed towards His Vicar. How much more fully so genuine a talent, here blossoming in rare beauty, would flower under the full inspiration of the Faith.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Two new books have recently appeared which cannot fail to delight admirers of the late Baron von Hügel. The first, **Readings from Friedrich von Hügel**, edited with an Introductory Essay by Mr. Algar Thorold (Dent: 7s. 6d. n.), is an excellent exposition of the Baron's whole mind, which will be most useful to those who have hitherto found him difficult to follow. It cannot be denied that he is difficult; chiefly, perhaps, because his style demands a long-sustained effort which does not admit of repose. Mr. Thorold has evidently felt that to break up the Baron's thought, and arrange it in a new and perhaps more consecutive order, would obviate this difficulty. He has introduced his work with an admirable essay, dwelling on the Baron's deep faith, and on his philosophy as a consequence of that faith, rather than as a searching towards it. In happy phrase he speaks of the Baron's thought "as a mine, access to which may be obtained by sinking at various points independent shafts." In the rest of the volume he has sunk those shafts for us, and has arranged the ore he has drawn up from them in an ordered system. Book I. deals with "The Approach to Religion," Book II., with Religion exemplified in "The Soul of a Saint." All the passages selected for these two parts, except two, are taken from "The Mystical Element of Religion." Book III., "The Philosophy of Religion," is made up chiefly from selections from the Baron's "Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion." We have here a worthy introduction to the Baron's mind; many who read the book will be tempted to attack the larger works.

Almost at the opposite extreme, illustrating von Hügel in himself, we have the **Letters from Baron Friedrich von Hügel to a Niece**, edited with an Introduction by the niece herself, Mrs. Gwendolen Greene (Dent: 7s. 6d. n.). The book is wonderfully alive, though it contains no surprises. The enthusiastic lover of all men and women who were open to his love, the giver of all he had and was that he might help them, the seer with a vision that included every generation, and saw the dependence of everyone upon every other, withal the loyal son of the Church to which he belonged, and to which he wished all others to belong, though he would not force a single one—this is the impression deepened in the minds of those familiar with his writings by the reading of these letters. Next there is an affectionateness of soul, expressed not only to the one to whom he writes, but also in his remarks concerning other friends. He sums them up in a sentence; he has no illusions concerning them; his geese are never swans; but always there is the same wistful yearning that they should come to the best of which they are capable. And the best, for him, is that they should see as he sees; the solemn greatness of the Church truly Catholic, and the expanding of mind, and heart, and soul that comes with membership within it. Lastly, one cannot but be deeply interested in the course of reading he selected for his niece's education, even at a mature age, and in the comments he makes—always far-reaching—on books and authors, ancient and modern. We are indeed grateful to Mrs. Greene for allowing these letters to be published. Her own introduction, supplementing the letters with reports of many conversations with her uncle, contains much that may not be neglected by one who would understand von Hügel's inner soul.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

Composed by Miss Cecily Hallack, whose charming sketches of the mind of youth, published as "Beardless Counsellors," originally appeared in our pages, a poem called **The Divine Office of the Kitchen** (Dolphin Press, Brighton: 6d.), engrossed and enscrolled by a daughter of Carmel, and printed on stout cardboard, should be an ornament in every servants' hall. For in simple yet clever language it enlarges on the counsel of St. Paul—"Do all for the glory of God,"—and shows how easily work may be turned into prayer.

The fortnightly issue of **The Catholic Mind** (America Press: 5 c.) has continued regularly during the past year to preserve striking utterances and articles for permanent use. The last (December) number contained an arresting sermon—"What is Peace?"—by Father Martin-dale. The first issue for 1929 begins well with the Constitution of the New Pontifical University, a discourse on "The Church our Mother," by the Archbishop of Cincinnati, and a sermon on "Charity," the noblest and most necessary virtue, by the Rev. T. Brosnan, S.J.

The C.T.S. surpassed itself in 1928 in the number of pamphlets actually issued—well over the million mark of the year previous. Not to mention reprints, the following are amongst the most recent:—**Some Answered Prayers**, compiled by the Rev. P. E. Hallett—the prayers being those addressed to the Blessed Martyrs, John Fisher and Thomas More; **The Martyrs of Sussex**, by N. M. Wilby, a noble and inspiring band; **The London Charterhouse**, by Rev. E. E. Kilburn, Cong. Orat., a guide to that historic institution written especially for Catholics, to whom it once belonged; **The Anglican Mind**, by Rev. John Ashton, S.J., a careful psychological study of that strange blend of earnestness and prejudice; **Edith Mary Moore**, an inspiring sketch of a modern girl who spent herself for others and died *consummata in brevi*: curiously enough, the date of her death is not given in the memoir; **Strong to Endure**, the life-story of a professed Religious of the Society of Marie Reparatrice. All the above are twopenny pamphlets. The Society has also reissued at one shilling each, revised editions of Cardinal Gasquet's **Short History of the Catholic Church in England** and Father Martindale's **Theosophy**; also a new issue of **The Antidote**, Vol. III, edited by Rev. J. Keating, S.J.

From the C.T.S. of Ireland come **Father Henry Young** (1786—1869), by Mrs. Conor Maguire, the life of a Dublin priest of outstanding holiness; **A Catholic Nation and a Catholic Press**, an historical treatment of a burning question; and two devotional pamphlets—**The Child prepared for Holy Communion**, by the Rev. F. de Zulueta, S.J., and **The Seven Dolours**, selected from Father Faber's book.

The C.T.S. of Canada has reprinted from our pages the striking paper on **Christian Social Democracy**, contributed by Dr. Donald A. MacLean of Washington University.

A second enlarged edition of Abbot Cummins' **Legends, Saints and Shrines of Knaresborough** (Borough Works: 1s.) shows that interest in that district is being maintained.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- ALLEN AND UNWIN, London.
Catholicism and Christianity. By C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D. Pp. xl. 708. Price, 21s. n.
- BEAUCHESE, Paris.
Theologia de Ecclesia. Vols. I. and II. By Bishop d'Herbigny. 3rd ed. Pp. xxvi. 332: 403.
- BEYAERT, Bruges.
De Virtute Castitatis. By L. Wouters, C.S.S.R. Pp. vii. 140. Price, 12.50 fr.
- BROWNE AND NOLAN, Dublin.
The Parables of Our Lord. Translated from the French by Père Ollivier, Op. By E. Leahy. Pp. xxv. 421. Price, 7s. 6d.
- BURNS, OATES AND WASHBOURNE, London.
The Catholic Directory, 1929. Pp. xiv. 900. Price, 3s. 6d. *The Catholic "Who's Who,"* 1929. Pp. 560. Price, 5s. *Is the Christian Religion True?* By O. R. Vassall-Phillips, C.S.S.R. Pp. xii. 213. Price, 1s. 6d. *The Inner Life of the Sisters of N.D.* Pp. xi. 87. Price, 2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d. *The Strong City*. By Alfred Noyes. Pp. 12. Price, 1s.
- CASA EDITRICE MARIETTI, Turin.
I Sinottici del Vecchio e del Nuovo Testamento. By Rev. P. Vanutelli. Pp. 107. Price, 5.50 l.
- DESSAIN, Mechlin.
Commentarium Lovaniense in C.J.C. Vol. I., Tome I., *Prolegomena*. By A. Van Hove. Pp. xx. 273. Price, 40.00 fr.
- EDITIONS SPES, Paris.
Leon Harmel et l'Initiative Ouvrière. By G. Guittou, S.J. Pp. 95. Price, 4.00 fr.
- GILL AND SON, Dublin.
Our Father's House. By Father Aloysius, O.S.F.C. Pp. xii. 276.
- HARDING AND MORE, London.
An Alphabet of the Altar. By E. V. Wareing. Illustrated. Pp. 50. Price, 2s. 6d., 3s. 6d., and 5s.
- JOHN MURPHY COMPANY, Baltimore.
Our Priestly Life. By J. Bruneau, S.J. Pp. 164. Price \$1.25 n.
- KING AND SON, London.
Towards Citizenship. Compiled by P. C. Challoner and V. L. Mathews. Pp. 94. Price, 2s. n.
- LES EDITIONS REIDER, Paris.
La Vie Chrétienne primitive. By Dom H. Leclercq. Illustrated. Pp. 87. Price, 16.50 fr.
- LIBRAIRIE VALOIS, Paris.
La fin d'une Mystification. By A. Lugan. Pp. 240. Price, 15.00 fr.
- LONGMANS, London.
The Riddle of Life. By Bishop N. S. Talbot. Pp. x. 110. Price, 2s. 6d. n. *Luther and the Reformation*. By James McKinnon, D.D. Vol. II. Pp. xvii. 338. Price, 16s. n.
- PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL STUDIES, Rome.
Doctrina Theol. Orientis Separati de SS. Eucharistia. Vol. II. By Rev. T. Spacil, S.J. Pp. 176. Price, 17.00 l.
- SANDS AND CO., London.
The Three Kings. By F. J. Bowen. Pp. 59. Price, 1s. n.
- SHEED AND WARD, London.
The Spirit of Catholicism. By Dr. Karl Adams. Translated by Dom J. McCann. Pp. x. 238. Price, 2s. 6d. n. *Tombs and Portraits of Medieval Popes*. By Mgr. H. K. Mann. Illustrated. Pp. vi. 152. Price, 15s. n.
- S.P.C.K., London.
The Anaphoras of the Ethiopic Liturgy. By J. M. Harden, D.D. Pp. 136. Price, 7s. 6d. *Ante-Nicene Exegesis of the Gospel*. By Harold Smith, D.D. Vol. V. Pp. vi. 347. Price, 7s. 6d. n. *The Albigensian Heresy*. By H. J. Warner, B.D. Vol. II. Pp. vii. 227. Price, 6s. n.
- TEQUI, Paris.
Symbolisme de l'Apparition de Lourdes. By Père J. E. Baragnon. Pp. xii. 234. Price, 11.50 fr. post free. *Ma Vie de Fils adoptif de Dieu*. 4 Vols. 380 pp. each. Price, 36.00 fr. in all. *Aux Seminaristes*. Compiled by Abbé A. Aubry. 2^e edit. Pp. 279. Price, 11.50 fr. *Saint Vincent de Paul*. By Abbé A. d'Agnel. Pp. 254. Price, 11.50 fr. *Conférences à la Jeunesse*. By Ch. Vandepitte, D.H. 3 Series, about 220 pp. each. Price 22.00 fr. or 7.50 fr. each. *Jeunes et Vieux Mariages*. By Abbé Grimaud. Pp. 270. Price, 11.00 fr. *Le Decalogue*. By Mgr. Besson. 2 Vols. Pp. 90. Price, 20.00 fr.
- THE AMERICA PRESS, New York.
God, Infinite and Reason. By W. J. Brosnan, S.J., Ph.D. Pp. 236. *The Life and Letters of Walter Drum*. By Joseph Goraieb, S.J. Pp. vi. 313. Price, \$3.00. *Fiction and its Makers*. Edited by F. X. Talbot, S.J. Pp. 204. Price, \$2.00.

op
to.
end
nes
pp.

TAL

de
By
6.

en.

Or.
om
ce,
its
gr.
p.

vic
n.
d.
he
D.
d.
By
I.

de
g-
50
its
80
in
m-
e
r.
é
e,
la
e,
p.
r.
s.
o.
e.
p.

y
p.
of
r-
A.
s.
p.